

DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

1/5



CLOSED
STACKS

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

REFERENCE
BOOK


Not to be taken from the Library

DEC 1 2 1995

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 03476 7401



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

<http://archive.org/details/26minutesofsanfran1973sa>

LIB 8

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 5, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 5, 1973, at 1:45 P.M. Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; John C. Farrell, Thomas J. Mellon, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Daniel Sullivan, Planner IV (Zoning); DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; Katherine Benziger, Planner II; Alan Lubliner, Planner II; Gary Craft, Planner I; Robin Jones, City Planning Intern; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Bob Bartlett represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of May 17 and June 14, 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, presented and summarized a report on traffic problems in the South Bayshore area.

President Newman read a letter which had been received from Lois K. Campbell expressing appreciation to the Commission for encouraging installation of landscaping on an open parking lot at 75 Minna Street.

**R73.27 - ENCROACHMENT PERMIT, KING, FOURTH, FIFTH AND JEWETT STREETS:
NEW SOUTHERN PACIFIC DEPOT FACILITIES
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JUNE 28, 1973)**

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, noted that he had recommended that he be authorized to report that the encroachment permits for the fence and bus bay would not affect the Master Plan; and, in addition, he had recommended that leasing of Jewett Street to the Southern Pacific would be preferable to issuance of a revocable permit for use of the street area. The Commission had taken the matter under advisement and had requested that a representative of Southern Pacific be present at today's meeting.

T. H. Kruttschnitt, Jr., Assistant to the Chief Enginer for Southern Pacific, advised the Commission that Southern Pacific had occupied Jewett Street in its entirety since 1914; and, except for the fact that the new station building would be partially located in the street area, no additional encroachment was being proposed at the present time. In fact, an interlocking tower which presently stands in the street area will be relocated to private property. He urged that the request for use of the street area be approved.

The Director stated that he realized that the City would acquire only a small amount of money from lease of the property; however, as a matter of principle, he felt that the proposed use of public property should be formalized on a leasehold basis. Furthermore, by clearly retaining control of the street area, the City would also be able to exercise a certain amount of control over the development of adjacent private properties if such development should occur. He stated that the matter had been discussed with the Real Estate Department; and he had been advised that the Real Estate Department has, in certain other instances, required leases as a matter of principle even when a small amount of money was involved.

Mr. Kruttschnitt stated that he had no idea how much money would be involved if the City were to lease the street area. He indicated that the street contains only 29,000 square feet of land area; and it was unclear to him whether the lease would cover the entire street area or merely the portion of the street to be occupied by the building.

Commissioner Rueda emphasized that the Commission's recommendation was advisory only and that it would not be binding on the Board of Supervisors; and, on that basis, he moved that the Director's recommendation be adopted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Farrell. When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Director to report that the granting of an encroachment permit for a fence approximately 5 feet inside the King Street right-of-way and across Fifth Street at King Street and at Townsend Street and for a bus bay at the west side of Fourth Street between King and Townsend Streets and for a station and shelter in Jewett Street and passenger platforms in Jewett and Fifth Streets does not affect the Master Plan. It was further recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the lease of Jewett Street between Fourth and Fifth Streets will be in conformity with the Master Plan.

2:00 P.M.

EE73.52 - PUBLIC HEARING ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROJECT PROPOSED ON THE BLOCKS BOUNDED GENERALLY BY SANSOME, FRONT, GREENWICH AND UNION STREETS.

Following a summary of the Environmental Impact Report by Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), the Commission received and responded to comments made by David Dibble, 28 Alta Street, and by Betty Rader, Chairman of the Environment Committee of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers. The Secretary read a written statement which had been received from Mrs. G. Bland Platt, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

JULY 5, 1973

At the conclusion of the hearing, Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that minor changes be made in the report to reflect concerns which had been expressed by Mrs. Platt in her statement. He remarked that the points raised by the other speakers had been covered in the report.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7034 be adopted with the following resolves:

"RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does hereby find that the final Environmental Impact Report, dated July 5, 1973, concerning Greenwich Square, vicinity of Sansome, Greenwich, Union and Front Streets, is adequate, accurate, and objective, and does hereby certify the completion of said report;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission in certifying the completion of said Report does hereby find that the project, as proposed, will not have a significant effect on the environment;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission takes said Final Environmental Impact Report into consideration before acting on the project itself under CU73.30 and does hereby signify such consideration by adopting said report."

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the offices of the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription.

CU73.30 - BLOCKS GENERALLY BOUNDED BY SANSOME, FRONT, GREENWICH AND UNION STREETS.

REQUEST FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR FOUR COMMERCIAL/OFFICE BUILDINGS AND REQUEST FOR AN EXCEPTION FROM THE BULK LIMITS OF SECTION 270 OF THE CITY PLANNING CODE; IN A C-2 DISTRICT, IN NORTHERN WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 3, AND PARTLY IN 84-E, 65-X and 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICTS.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has a total area of 6.284 acres comprised of 1.736 acres in each of Assessor's Blocks 84, 107 and 108 and 1.076 acres in Assessor's Block 83. He stated that the entire subject site is in a C-2 district and in the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 3 in which special use district projects over three acres in area require planned unit development authorization. The southwest and west portion of the site, Assessor's Block 107 and the western half of Assessor's Block 84, are in an 84-E Height and Bulk district. The easterly half of Assessor's Block 84 is subject to a 65-X Height and Bulk district; and all of Assessor's Blocks 83 and 108, the eastern portion of the subject site, are subject

to a 40-X Height and Bulk district. He stated that the applicant proposed to construct a development consisting of four buildings containing a total gross floor area of approximately 865,000 square feet for commercial office space, including approximately 20,000 square feet of ground level retail and service space. The buildings would range from 4 to 8 stories in height. The eight story building on Assessor's Block 107 would exceed the building bulk limitation applicable under the 84-E Height and Bulk district; and the application which had been filed requested conditional use authorization to modify that bulk limitation. He stated that the applicant's proposal also included landscaping the surface of Filbert Street and closing that street to general vehicular traffic. The sub-surface street area would be used for off-street parking. However, no formal application for use of the street area had yet been submitted; and that matter was not before the Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Farrell asked if the overall project is within the bulk limitations of the City Planning Code in spite of the fact that one building would require a variance from the bulk limitations. Mr. Passmore replied that each of the buildings being proposed would comply with the floor area ratio standards of the C-2 zoning district. The bulk controls from which a variance was being requested were, however, a different matter. The building which he had mentioned exceeded the permitted bulk limits on two floors. The other buildings, because of their limited height, would not be subject to the bulk restrictions. He also pointed out that one of the buildings which would be in an 84-foot height limit district would have an actual height of only 65 feet.

Don Wyler, representing the applicant, displayed and described a site plan and a model of the proposed development. He remarked that the Master Plan for the Northern Waterfront calls for a mixture of development in the subject neighborhood; and, since a residential development had been proposed for property located to the north of the subject site, the applicant had decided on a project which would contain a mixture of office and commercial uses. He stated that a number of organizations such as San Francisco Beautiful, San Francisco Tomorrow, the San Francisco Loyal Opposition, the Citizens Waterfront Committee, SPUR, The Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and others had been contacted early in the year before specific plans for the project had been prepared; and, through a series of meetings with representatives from those organizations, plans for the project had evolved. Suggestions which had been received included the importance of maintaining view corridors, the desirability of a lower building on one of the blocks to preserve views from properties on Telegraph Hill, and provision of a number of landscaped courtyards rather than a large central plaza; and those suggestions had been included in the final plans. All parking for the project would be subterranean. One of the buildings would exceed the plan dimensional limits of the 84-E Height and Bulk district; but the additional square footage was needed in order to make the project viable. He emphasized, however, that the City Planning Code provides that special exemptions from the bulk limits can be granted if greater bulk permits achievement of a distinctly better design or if it permits development of a building or structure with wide-spread public service benefits and significance to the community at large. While the second factor would probably not apply to the proposed project, he did feel that the additional amount of open space which could be achieved in the project as a result of

the increased bulk of the building at upper floor levels, did, in fact, constitute better design. Including the landscaped portion of Filbert Street, the project would provide 115,000 square feet of open space, and an area larger than that occupied by Union Square. He stated that the applicants had continued to meet with neighborhood groups and individuals; and they had agreed that all lights in the project, except those which are legally required, would be turned off at night so that the project would not have a bright appearance as viewed from Telegraph Hill.

Gio Obata, architect for the applicant, stated that his client had instructed him to design a project with approximately 860,000 square feet of office space and with some commercial space at ground level. Before preparing the plans, he had decided to meet with citizen organizations; and he had tried to take cognizance of their concerns as the details of the plans evolved.

President Newman, remarking that the members of the Commission were thoroughly familiar with plans for the proposed development, suggested that it would be proper to hear from members of the audience at this point.

Gerson Bakar, the applicant, stated that he was present to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission; and he stated that he would like to have an opportunity to comment on points which might be raised by members of the audience.

Robert Katz, Chairman of the Waterfront Committee of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stated that he had been quoted in the Daily Commercial News as being opposed to the proposed project; however, what he had actually said was that he had understood that major changes had been made in the plans for the project and that those changes could not be accepted without study. However, it now appeared that no significant changes had been made in the plans. He noted that Betty Rader, Chairman of the Environment Committee of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, had addressed the Commission during the public hearing on the Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project and had indicated that she had been authorized by the President of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers to speak on behalf of the organization. He, himself, had not read the Environmental Impact Report; and he deferred to Mrs. Rader's expertise in that area. However, in view of the fact that her statement may have left the Commission with the impression that the Telegraph Hill Dwellers were opposed to the project, he wished to emphasize that John Holmes, the President of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, had advised him that the official position of the organization was favorable to the project. He then proceeded to read the following prepared statement:

"I would like to submit the following statement on behalf of THE TELEGRAPH HILL DWELLERS and the CITIZENS WATERFRONT COMMITTEE.

"I. A NEW CLIMATE

"Five years ago, the International Market Center caused a city-wide confrontation.

JULY 5, 1973

"We are greatly encouraged that the spirit of confrontation is gradually being replaced by a spirit of cooperation.

"The Telegraph Hill Dwellers, the Citizens Waterfront Committee and concerned citizens had several meetings with the developers at which our mutual concerns were ironed out. We wish to thank the developers for this opportunity.

"II. REGRETS

"There are two aspects of this project which we regret"

"1. We had hoped that the beautiful brick warehouse with its arched facades on Greenwich and Battery could have been preserved. Since the wanton and unnecessary destruction of the old Seawall Warehouse by the former Market Center developers, the retention of the brick warehouse at Greenwich and Battery would have maintained some of the original waterfront character well worth preserving.

"2. The request for a 100% bulk increase on two stories of Block 'A' worries us, both as a precedent and because of the large mass involved.

Section 271 of the Code states that 'There may be some exceptional cases in which ... limits may properly be permitted to be exceeded to a certain degree.' A 100% increase is of course a considerable increase.

"III. COMPROMISE

"On the other hand, the developers have made a considerable effort to compensate for this variance.

"1. They have kept all of Block 'B' at 65 ft., rather than to go to 84 ft. on half the block, as they could have done.

"2. We have been assured that the overall floor area ratio (excluding the Filbert St. Mall and the setback along the Embarcadero) is being kept at 3.25:1, and that it does not exceed 5:1 on any of the four blocks.

"3. Setbacks, terraces and the visual breakup of large masses will reduce the massive effects.

"4. Considerable areas have been set aside for landscaped open spaces, which will remain accessible to the public.

JULY 5, 1973

- "5. There will be extensive planting along the edges of the buildings.
- "6. The Filbert Street Mall will be used only for landscaping.
- "7. At our request, the developers have agreed to include guarantees along the following lines in the Conditional Use Permit:
- a) Open space and landscaping shall be no less than on the latest models and plans.
 - b) Trees shall be planted along the Embarcadero facades to relieve their uniformity and length as viewed from the Embarcadero.
 - c) The effect of the mechanical penthouses on the large roof areas, as viewed from Telegraph Hill, shall be substantially softened by adequate landscaping.
 - d) The developer and his successors will be responsible for the maintenance of all landscaping.

"IV. ENDORSEMENT

"If all the points mentioned in the above compromise are met, the TELEGRAPH HILL DWELLERS and the CITIZENS WATERFRONT COMMITTEE will be glad to support the Greenwich Square development as their new neighbor.

"V. NO PRECEDENT

"We would like to stress that this approval cannot set any precedent for future requests of variances by other developers. If our Zoning and our Urban Design Plan are to have any meaning, variances must be kept at a strict minimum and can be granted only in exchange for substantial compensating factors.

"Large developments always pose a serious threat to the scale and quality of adjoining neighborhoods, and a proliferation of megastructures in small-scale neighborhoods must be avoided.

"VI. THANKS TO THE DEVELOPERS ...AND HOPE FOR SIMILAR COMPROMISES BY OTHER DEVELOPERS

"In view of the successful cooperation with the ALPHA LAND CO. and with GERSON BAKAR ASSOCIATES, we have every hope that the developers of GOLDEN GATEWAY, PHASE III, will also find it possible

to work out a compromise, and to honor the unanimous recommendations your Commission made on January 4, 1973.

"It would be of great benefit to all concerned if the era of confrontation could be replaced by a climate of cooperation."

In conclusion, Mr. Katz stated that the applicant had shown him a draft resolution of approval which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he suggested that Condition No. 13 should be amended with language which would specify that the amount of landscaped open space to be provided should be no less than that indicated on plans and models submitted to the City Planning Commission on July 5.

Charles Starbuck, representing the San Francisco Loyal Opposition, stated that he did object to the proposed project in terms of the impact which it would have on traffic in the area; but he acknowledged that the developer had no control over traffic. Also, while he realized that authorization for excessive bulk in one building would permit the developer to keep the height of another building at 65 feet rather than to take advantage of the 84-foot height limit permitted, he felt that granting of the requested variance would set an unfortunate precedent. It appeared to him that the developer had made an effort in good faith to work with citizens groups; and he had gone out of his way to provide sufficient open space and real amenities. He believed that significant progress had been made towards involving citizens in the preparation of plans for major developments; and he felt that the developer should be commended for the way in which he had handled the situation.

William Liskamn, a resident of Napier Lane, stated that he had been overwhelmed by the cooperation on everyone's part; however, he believed that the building which was being proposed on parcel "A" would block his view. While the developer might suffer economic hardship if he were required to remove the top two floors of the building, it was nevertheless his opinion that the entire project should be subject to a 65-foot height limit.

A member of the audience stated that he was in favor of new development. However, he emphasized that the subject area is an historic part of San Francisco, having formerly been the City's waterfront; and he felt that an effort should be made to preserve the few historic buildings which are left in the area. He had a high regard for the quality of the new development being proposed; but he felt that the developers should retain one or two buildings which presently exist on the property. He remarked that the two buildings have had an interesting history and were spared by the fire in 1906; and he felt that retention of the two buildings would serve as an asset to the proposed development.

Mr. Bakar described a photograph of the northern waterfront skyline which was taken in 1954; and he emphasized that the proposed project would not in any way destroy the profile of the City. In fact, one of the buildings which would be torn down to make way for the proposed development is as high as the highest building

JULY 5, 1973

being proposed; and, as a result, the project would not block any views which presently exist. He stated that the Ice House has a height of 110 feet whereas the highest building in his project would have a height of only 84 feet.

Commissioner Porter observed that the proposed development would contain the first low-rise office-buildings to be constructed in San Francisco in many years.

Mr. Bakar stated that his project would demonstrate that low-rise office construction is a viable thing in San Francisco. He also remarked that the open spaces which he would provide would bring a suburban feeling into the community; and he emphasized that the total amount of open space to be provided would exceed the open space available at Huntington Park or at the turnaround on Telegraph Hill. He stated that he had agreed to preserve the air rights above Filbert Street as open space in perpetuity; and, with the addition of that open space, the total open space of the project would exceed that available in Union Square.

President Newman asked if the 46-foot setback required on the east side of the property for future development of the proposed Maritime Parkway had been included in the calculation of open space. Mr. Bakar replied in the negative. He indicated, however, that the setback area would be landscaped with a great many trees as recommended by Mr. Katz.

Mrs. Friedel Klussman stated that she was extraordinarily pleased by the manner in which the developers had worked with concerned citizens from the very beginning; and she wished that the developers of the Golden Gateway would demonstrate a similar spirit of cooperation.

The Director recommended that the application be approved subject to 19 specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions and adding the language to Condition No. 13 which had been recommended by Mr. Katz, he recommended that the draft resolution, as revised, be adopted.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, as revised, be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 7035 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by the Director.

At 4:40 P.M. President Newman announced a five minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:45 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU73.25 - 1356 FULTON STREET, NORTH LINE, 220 FEET WEST OF DIVISADERO STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A BOARD AND CARE HOME FOR 25 MENTALLY DISTURBED PERSONS; IN AN R-3 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the subject application had been filed to legalize the use of the existing dwelling on the property as a residential care home for 25 mentally disturbed persons.

Charles Turner, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant has had a good "track record" in terms of the operation of her residential care home; and, on that basis, he felt that the conditional use application should be approved. He recognized that the staff of the Department of City Planning was concerned about the distribution of such facilities throughout the City; however, he believed that that problem will not be handled by the State for a considerable time.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

The Secretary read a letter which had been received from George Wayt, licensing representative for the State Department of Mental Hygiene. The letter indicated that a determination had been made that there is adequate space in the applicant's building for 25 residents; and no difficulties were anticipated in licensing the facility, provided that zoning clearance is obtained from the Department of City Planning.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, read the following statement:

"The Commission and staff have previously indicated concern with two aspects which apply not only to this case, but to a number of similar facilities providing care to mentally handicapped persons and other care homes.

"First, is the size of the facility. Most care homes are modest, generally not more than six beds. The impact upon a neighborhood of an individual small care home would appear to be minimal. A larger care home, such as before you today, or a grouping of several smaller facilities, may well have more serious ramifications. This is our second concern: the location of various types and sizes of care homes.

"We have undertaken a study of this second point, with the best information presently available. The maps before you shows locations of care homes for mentally handicapped - The Blue Dots - and Homes for the Aged - The Yellow Dots.

"From our preliminary work, it is clear that some areas of the City are heavily impacted at present. Quite frankly, we do not have all of the existing facilities located. More information is being received almost daily, particularly regarding heretofore unknown care homes. Further, in checking some indicated locations, it would seem that a number of the licensed care homes do not in fact exist. To add to the difficulties, several state agencies involved in this field have been merged only recently and reliable information is now, more than ever, difficult to obtain.

"For these reasons, I recommend to the Commission that this conditional use application be taken under advisement until such time as policy regarding the location of care homes can be considered by the

Commission. I would further recommend that the Commission authorize the staff to contact the State to request coordination and cooperation to the extent required to develop such a policy for your consideration as well as for use by the State."

Commissioner Farrell asked if the applicant's use of the property would be in violation of the City Planning Code if the subject application were to be disapproved. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative. However, if the Commission were to take the matter under advisement, the use could legally continue until such time as final action is taken on the matter by the Commission.

Commissioner Mellon asked if there are many other mental care homes in San Francisco which have as many as 25 patients. The Director replied that the staff was aware of three mental care homes which have more than 15 patients, one of which has 50 patients. In reply to a further question raised by Commissioner Mellon, the Director stated that the staff does not have any specific knowledge of the quality of the care provided in those facilities.

President Newman asked about the length of time which the subject facility has been in operation. Mr. Turner replied that the applicant has operated the facility for 7 or 8 years. In reply to further questions raised by President Newman, Mr. Turner stated that 25 patients have always been housed in the home; and he indicated that the type of facility which the applicant operates will be needed for the foreseeable future.

Commissioner Rueda inquired about the length of time which the Director would recommend for holding the subject application under advisement. The Director replied that he did not know how long it would take to accomplish the objectives he hoped to achieve.

Commissioner Porter noted that the subject property is located across the street from a garage; and, as a result, she did not feel that the use would have detrimental effect on the neighborhood. Nevertheless, she had been prepared to vote for disapproval of the application because it seemed to her that the building might not have adequate space for 25 patients. However, in view of the fact that the State licensing representative had been of the opinion that sufficient space is available, she suggested that the conditional use application might be approved for a two-year period. At the expiration of that time, the matter could be reviewed again in the light of any staff studies which might be completed during the interim.

The Director observed that the State licensing agency is concerned only with bedroom space and is not concerned with the amount of outside space available. He remarked on the fact that no one had appeared to speak in opposition to the subject application; and he emphasized that such neighborhoods, in which no one cares, are the ones which will inevitably be impacted with such uses unless distribution policies are adopted and enforced.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that neighborhoods which become impacted with such uses will tend to become institutionalized; and he felt that mental patients would be no better off in such an environment than if they had remained in large institutions. He believed that the Director had suggested a wise course of action; and he indicated that he would support the Director's recommendation.

President Newman stated that it seemed to him that the applicant was being penalized because of a lack of State and local planning. Under the circumstances, his inclination would be to support approval of the application for a limited period of time.

Commissioner Farrell stated that he agreed with President Newman. He also observed that such uses are concentrated in older areas of the City because of the size of the older buildings in those area.

The Director advised the Commission that two more conditional use applications for residential care homes for mentally disturbed persons would come before the Commission on August 2.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Farrell, and carried 3 to 2 that this matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of July 12 and that the staff of the Department of City Planning be instructed to prepare a draft resolution of approval for two years subject to appropriate conditions. Commissioners Farrell, Newman and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioners Mellon and Rueda voted "No". Commissioner Rueda stated that he had voted against the motion because he felt that an excessive number of patients are housed in the subject building.

CU73.26 - 1660 GEARY BOULEVARD, JAPANESE TRADE AND CULTURAL CENTER GARAGE,
NORTH LINE, 100 FEET EAST OF WEBSTER STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A CAR WASH WITH GASOLINE DISPENSING
FACILITIES; IN A C-2 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a service station within the Japanese Trade and Cultural Center Garage. He stated that the applicant proposed to install automatic car wash equipment in the service station.

Dave Cox, representing the applicant, stated that approval of the application would allow the operators of the service station to remodel their facility and to install a small car wash. He hoped that the application would be approved.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

JULY 5, 1973

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Cox replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 7036 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

CU73.27 - SOUTHEAST CORNER OF HYDE AND BUSH STREETS.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO EXPAND A PARKING LOT;
IN AN R-5-C DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular corner lot with a frontage of 58.75 feet on Bush Street and a frontage of 75.5 feet on Hyde Street for a total area of 5,140 square feet. The property is vacant; and the St. Francis Hospital had filed the subject application requesting permission to expand an existing 18 stall parking lot by the addition of 18 parking stalls on the subject property.

Allan Robinson, architect for the applicant, stated that there is a shortage of parking spaces in the area; and he felt that expansion of the existing parking lot onto the subject lot would be of benefit to the general public.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Robinson replied in the affirmative.

President Newman then asked if an attendant would be on duty in the proposed parking lot. Mr. Robinson replied in the negative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7037 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

CU73.28 - 416-420 - 17TH AVENUE, EASTLINE, 100 FEET SOUTH OF GEARY BOULEVARD.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT WITH 12
PARKING STALLS; IN AN R-2 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which consists of two lots each having 25 feet of frontage on 17th Avenue and a uniform depth of



120 feet for a total area of 6,000 square feet. The applicant proposed to use the vacant lots as a parking lot with approximately 12 parking spaces for the Sumitomo Bank which is located on Geary Boulevard. He stated that a similar conditional use application had been disapproved by the City Planning Commission on December 2, 1971, and by the Board of Supervisors on appeal on January 17, 1972. At that time, buildings had existed on lots. However, the buildings were later condemned, demolition permits were issued on December 21, 1972, and the buildings were subsequently razed.

Joji Hikawa, Vice-President of the Sumitomo Bank, stated that the parking lot is needed for customers of the bank.

Mitsura Tada, architect for the applicant, stated that 60% of the customers of the bank arrive in private automobiles; and he indicated that the 15 minute metered zones on the street are not adequate. Therefore, the proposed parking lot was being requested for the convenience of the bank's customers.

Carl Sachs, Past-President of the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association, remarked that the Commission had previously authorized a number of parking lots on residentially zoned properties in the Avenues to serve businesses located on Geary Boulevard, several of which had involved the removal of existing residential buildings. He stated that traffic on Geary Boulevard has increased significantly since the expressway was constructed; and he believed that the street will carry an even greater amount of traffic in the future after the overpass at Masonic Avenue has been completed. He stated that there are not enough parking spaces on Geary Boulevard to serve the customers of the commercial district; and he felt that the Commission should approve the parking lot which was being proposed for the convenience of the customers of the Sumitomo Bank. He advised the Commission that the two houses which had been torn down by the bank had been condemned by the City.

Melvin Lee, 434 - 17th Avenue, stated that he and other residents of the subject neighborhood had addressed letters to the Commission in opposition to the subject application. He pointed out that westbound traffic on Geary Boulevard is not allowed to make a left turn into 17th Avenue; and, as a result, westbound vehicles wishing to use the parking lot would turn left on 18th Avenue to Anza Street, left on Anza to 17th Avenue and north on 17th Avenue to the parking lot. Under the circumstances, the parking lot would significantly increase the traffic count in the adjacent residential neighborhood. He stated that the Sumitomo Bank is supposed to be a neighborhood bank; and he felt that its customers should be able to walk to the bank if they have business to transact. He advised the Commission that the parking lot at the Value Giant on the north side of Geary Boulevard is not fully utilized. He also remarked that the dwellings which previously occupied the subject properties had been allowed to deteriorate before they were demolished. In conclusion, he stated that residents of the neighborhood felt that the proposed parking lot would be detrimental to the health and safety of their children.

Arden Danekas, President of Planning Area for the Richmond (PAR), stated that the policies of his organization are to maintain the family orientation of the district, to preserve, maintain, and improve the existing supply of family housing stock,

JULY 5, 1973

to improve the quality of life within the neighborhood, to protect the quality of life by controlling development, and to reduce non-residential parking in the district. He then proceeded to read the following prepared statement:

"We are all here to once again fight this battle, that has already been fought. That is a shame to waste our time and your time. And is probably a slap at the Commission. This parking lot proposal is:

- "1) Non-conforming
- 2) in an R-2 Residential Neighborhood
- 3) is not desirable
- 4) is not necessary because Value Giant has excess parking during banking hours
- 5) has destroyed needed housing
- 6) there is no place for a buffer
- 7) would probably be used as private parking for bank officers

"Now how did we happen to be back here just one year after this proposal was turned down and the Supervisors turned down this proposal? Well your staff approved a demolition permit that is why. Obviously your staff knew or should have known of this case and its history. So why was this demolition permit granted without Commission approval. Who sets policy in planning - the Dept. or the staff?

"Sumitomo acquired control of this property sometime ago - more than one year ago in fact. Immediately upon acquisition they callously emptied the buildings and left them vacant to be vandalized and one must surmise unhesitatingly set out to cause the neighborhood consternation. In Sept. 72 and Oct. 72 the Building Inspection Dept. sent out notices on the property but at no time started proceedings to condemn the property nor did they have any reason to start proceedings.

"In Dec. the buildings were destroyed. There was no valid reason for these buildings to be destroyed. The only reason an outside observer can attach to this miasma is the utter callousness of the applicant and the wanton disregard by them of neighborhood values.

"In law there is an axiom that you cannot come to court with dirty hands and expect relief. We submit that the applicant has indeed come in here with dirty hands. To add insult to injury they have bought the house immediately behind the proposed parking lot, moved in an employee. Why did they do this. In order to run the lot thru from one block to the other? Or what?

JULY 5, 1973

"At one time I asked staff for permit to convert a single family dwelling but was refused because I could just go make do with what I had. Well the Sumitomo Bank can make do a whole lot easier than I can so they can put two flats back without much trouble.

"In closing I'll ask this but not expect an answer, who among you, if you had a choice, would live next to a parking lot?"

Commissioner Porter advised Mr. Danekas that demolition permits are routinely approved by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Mr. Sachs disagreed with Mr. Lee's comments about automotible access to subject property and stated that he believed that people would have no trouble whatsoever getting into the lot.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He remarked that 17th Avenue, south of Geary Boulevard, is a quiet, pleasant residential street. The proposed parking lot would increase traffic on 17th Avenue and would thereby threat the residential character of the area and affect property values. A lot such as the one proposed, which would be used only during banking hours, would not be in conformity with the Master Plan designation of the property or the intensification of residential use along the Geary Corridor; and, in addition, it would not further the goal of more family housing in the City. No public need for or benefit to be derived from the proposed facility had been demonstrated. In conclusion he stated that the applicant's proposal was contrary to the express wishes of both the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors insofar as the same case had been heard, denied, appealed, and denied one year ago.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7038 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU73.14 - 156-162 GUERRERO STREET, WEST LINE, 105 FEET SOUTH OF CLINTON PARK.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT FOR 43 CARS TO BE USED
AS PART OF THE SERVICE OPERATION OF S & C MOTORS, INC.; IN AN
R-4 DISTRICT.
(POSTPONED FROM HEARING ON JUNE 7, 1973)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular parcel with 105 feet of frontage on Guerrero Street and a depth of 130 feet for a total area of 30,600 square feet. The property, which is zoned R-4, is vacant. It had previously been used as a parking lot for Mary's Help Hospital. The applicant had filed the subject application in order to legalize use of the property for temporary storage of customers' cars being serviced at S & C Motors at 2001 Market Street or at 25 Dolores Street.

IN SENATE, JANUARY 10, 1901.
REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE
IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SENATE
JANUARY 1, 1899.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

ALBANY: J. B. LEECH, STATE PRINTER.
1901.

Alan Garfield, attorney for S & C Motors, Inc., stated that the firm which he represented has a large service operation and inadequate facilities for customer parking. As a result, interim daytime use of the subject property for storage and parking of customer automobiles was a matter of importance. He remarked that the property had been used for 20 years by Mary's Help Hospital as a parking lot. The Hospital still owns the property but wishes to dispose of it; and he indicated that his client's lease could be cancelled at any time if someone should wish to purchase the property. The property is fenced and has an electrically controlled gate; and the only people who have access to the property are S & C employees. The lot is usually vacant at night unless a customer has left his car with the company overnight.

Bruce Goecker, Vice-President of S & C Motors, stated that he was present to respond to any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He stated that the parking lot is not proximate to the commercial use with which it is associated; and approval of the subject application would legalize a commercial use in the heart of a residential area. He remarked that there are adequate commercially zoned properties along Valencia Street which is only one block to the east. He stated that use of the property as a parking lot would not further the provision of family housing in the City; and he remarked that no public need for or benefit from the applicant's proposal had been demonstrated. When the property had been used by Mary's Help Hospital as a parking lot, that use had been considered an automatic conditional use; however, the same circumstances did not apply in the present situation. He also remarked that S & C Motors store automobiles on a pier on the waterfront; and, under the circumstances, the distance between the facilities did not seem to be a major factor of concern.

Mr. Goecker confirmed that his firm does conduct activities on Pier 34; however, the nature of those activities is to prepare new automobiles for sale. Because S & C Motors is located on major transit routes to Downtown San Francisco, its customers usually leave their automobiles all day long, even when the work can be accomplished in one-half hour. He stated that the number of Ford dealers in San Francisco has been reduced from 6 to 3; and because of new equipment designed to reduce pollution, the automobiles must be serviced more often. He stated that the parking lot is never used after 6:00 at night; and, although the parking lot does have light fixtures, they are not connected or used. In conclusion, he advised the Commission that his firm does not charge its customers for storage of their vehicles.

Commissioner Farrell observed that the parking lot can accommodate only 43 cars; and, in view of the fact that the cars are brought to and taken from the lot by employees of S & C Motors, only a minimum amount of movement is involved. He asked if any automobile repairs are done on the lot. Mr. Goecker replied in the negative.

The first of the year was a very successful one for the company. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The second of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The third of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The fourth of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The fifth of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The sixth of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The seventh of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

The eighth of the year was also a very successful one. The sales were up to the mark and the profits were also good. The management was very efficient and the employees were very hard working. The company was very lucky to have such a good year.

Commissioner Mellon asked if traffic congestion is a problem for S & C Motors at the present time. Mr. Goecker replied in the affirmative, indicating that traffic congestion is particularly bad during the morning rush hour. He also noted that BART construction is taking place in the area; and, as a result, on-street parking is very limited.

Commissioner Mellon asked if he were correct in understanding that the lease held by S & C Motors on the subject property has a 30-day cancellation clause. Mr. Goecker replied in the affirmative and indicated that they had occupied the property under those circumstances for approximately 4 years.

Commissioner Rueda asked if S & C Motors have any alternative plans for accommodating customer automobiles in case the subject property should be sold. Mr. Goecker replied in the negative, indicating that S & C Motors would probably have to acquire another parcel of property or move its service department to another area under such circumstances.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he was impressed by the fact that the applicant's leasehold on the property has a 30-day cancellation clause; and he emphasized that under such circumstances the property is virtually available at any time for residential construction. For that reason, he felt that the application should be approved for a two-year period.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that this matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of July 12, 1973, and that the staff of the Department of City Planning be instructed to prepare a draft resolution of approval for 2 years subject to appropriate conditions during the interim.

ZM73.21 - 2000-2048 AND 2021-2039 BAKER STREET AND 3020-3110 CLAY STREET.
R-3 TO AN R-2 DISTRICT.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JUNE 7, 1973)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that this matter had been taken under advisement from the meeting of June 7 at the request of the attorney for the owner of a vacant parcel of property which had been included in the application. The attorney had explained that his client was vacationing in Europe and that he had not been able to reach him to determine what position he wished to take with regard to the proposed reclassification.

George Link, one of the applicants, indicated that most of the applicants were present in the audience; and he stated that they would be willing to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

Mr. Simpson, owner of the vacant parcel of property, stated that he had no objection to the proposed reclassification.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7039 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CU73.29 - 2007 FRANKLIN STREET, WEST LINE, 76.625 FEET SOUTH OF JACKSON STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PHILANTHROPIC OR ELEEMOSYNARY INSTITUTION FOR USE BY THE FOUNDATION FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE; IN AN R-5 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular parcel with a 94,375-foot frontage on Franklin Street and a depth of 137.50 feet for a total area of 12,976.563 square feet. The property is zoned R-5; however, in Resolution No. 7023 which was adopted on May 31, 1973, the Commission had recommended that the property be reclassified to R-3. The property is in a 40-X Height and Bulk district. The property is developed with a large single-family residence known as the Haas-Lilienthal House. The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, owner of the property, proposed to open the Haas-Lilienthal House to public visitation and to certain community uses and to create two residential apartments, each with independent access and off-street parking. The apartments would provide income which would pay for maintenance of the property.

Charles Page, President of the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, felt that Mr. Steele had adequately summarized the nature of the application. He noted that the house had been given to the foundation; and he advised the Commission that one of the conditions of the gift was that the house should be open for visitation.

President Newman asked if the foundation intended to charge a fee for visiting the house. Mr. Page replied in the affirmative, indicating that the fee would be \$1 for adults.

President Newman then inquired about the availability of off-street parking on the site. Mr. Page stated that the property has a three-car garage. One off-street parking space will be allocated to each of the apartments.

President Newman stated that he regarded the foundation's role in the preservation of the Haas-Lilienthal House to be an admirable endeavor; and he felt that it would be most unfortunate for the City if the house should have to be torn down.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to one condition which would require that use of the building should be in general conformity with a plan which had been submitted and which had been marked "Exhibit A".



After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7040 and that the application be approved subject to the condition which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

ZM73.22 - 334-36 CLAREMONT STREET, WEST LINE, 100 FEET SOUTH OF
ULLOA STREET, R-1-D TO A C-2 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular parcel with a 45 feet of frontage on Claremont and a depth of 118 feet for a total lot area of 5,310 square feet. He stated that the property is presently occupied by a non-conforming use with a May 2, 1980, termination date on the ground floor and 8 dwelling units on the upper two floors. If the application for reclassification of the property to C-2 were to be approved, the non-conforming use would become conforming.

George Choppelas, attorney for the applicant, stated that the details cited in the case report which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning were accurate. The building had been constructed in 1929 with a commercial use on the ground floor; and the same family had continued to operate the business. The business presently has a non-conforming status and is subject to termination in 1980. The owner of the property had recently renovated the premises and had tried to obtain an improvement loan to finance the work; however, the loan had been difficult to get because of the non-conforming status of the ground floor use. Furthermore, if the owner of the property wished to sell it, it would be impossible for him to get financing for the buyer as long as the property has non-conforming use status. The eight dwelling units on the upper floors of the building would be permitted to remain beyond 1980 in any case; however, if the subject application were not to be approved, the business on the ground floor would have to be replaced with a dwelling unit in 1980. Such a dwelling unit would be quite large; and it would not have a separate off-street parking space. In conclusion, Mr. Choppelas distributed photographs of the area to members of the Commission.

Commissioner Farrell asked if the ground floor of the building had been designed for commercial use. Mr. Choppelas replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Rueda asked if the applicant had any plans to expand the ground floor business. Mr. Cook, operator of the business, replied in the negative.

Commissioner Farrell remarked that he had not seen any signs on the building. Mr. Cook replied that there is only one small sign on the door of his business. In all respects, the business is a quiet operation. He emphasized that all four corners of the intersection of Claremont Boulevard and Ulloa Street are developed with commercial uses.

Vincent Kaufmann, a realtor, remarked that the subject building is well maintained, that it has no advertising, and that the commercial activity does not interfere with the adjacent residential area; and he confirmed that non-conforming use status does make it difficult for property owners to get financing to remodel or sell their properties. He felt that the application should be approved.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be disapproved. He remarked that the subject neighborhood is distinguished with one-family detached buildings; and he felt that approval of the application would result in possible, and even probable, commercial intrusion into the residential area. In fact, if the property were reclassified, a wide range of commercial activities could take place on the site as principal permitted uses. He stated that the non-conforming use can continue until 1980, at which time it can be converted into a dwelling unit; and, in this case, the requirement for an off-street parking space would not apply. He observed that the adjacent parking lot serves to buffer the residential area from the commercial area and is topographically separated from the residential area. In conclusion, he stated that the applicant had not demonstrated any public need for or benefit to be derived from the proposed re-classification.

Mr. Choppelas acknowledged that the possibility of increased commercial activity on the property might make it difficult for the Commission to rezone the property to C-2; however, unless some action were taken, his client's ability to sell his property would be limited and the future of Mr. Cook's business would remain in limbo.

Commissioner Farrell remarked that the business had been located on the subject property for a long time; and if the Commission could do anything to permit the business to continue beyond 1980, he felt that action should be taken accordingly.

Commissioner Rueda asked if the applicant could request that the use of extended beyond 1980 without a reclassification. Mr. Steele replied in the negative.

Commissioner Porter stated that she sympathized with the owner of the property and with the operator of the business. However, if the property were to be reclassified, circumstances would inevitably change; and the property might be used for any one of the wide range of commercial activities which are permitted in C-2 Districts.

Mr. Choppelas stated that it might be possible to establish a covenant running with the land which would convey to neighboring property owners certain rights which would enable them to prevent the owner of the subject property from developing his property in a different way even if it were to be rezoned C-2. If the Commission would be willing to take the matter under advisement, he stated that he would discuss the feasibility of such an approach with the City Attorney.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Mellon that this matter be taken under advisement for one month.

1. The first of the three years mentioned above was a year of unusual prosperity for the country. The crops were abundant and the weather was favorable. The people were content and the government was successful in its policy.

2. The second year was a year of adversity. The crops were poor and the weather was unfavorable. The people were discontented and the government was unsuccessful in its policy.

3. The third year was a year of transition. The crops were moderate and the weather was moderate. The people were moderate and the government was moderate in its policy.

4. The fourth year was a year of progress. The crops were good and the weather was good. The people were happy and the government was successful in its policy.

5. The fifth year was a year of decline. The crops were poor and the weather was poor. The people were discontented and the government was unsuccessful in its policy.

6. The sixth year was a year of recovery. The crops were good and the weather was good. The people were happy and the government was successful in its policy.

7. The seventh year was a year of prosperity. The crops were abundant and the weather was favorable. The people were content and the government was successful in its policy.

8. The eighth year was a year of adversity. The crops were poor and the weather was unfavorable. The people were discontented and the government was unsuccessful in its policy.

9. The ninth year was a year of transition. The crops were moderate and the weather was moderate. The people were moderate and the government was moderate in its policy.

10. The tenth year was a year of progress. The crops were good and the weather was good. The people were happy and the government was successful in its policy.

JULY 5, 1973

Commissioner Rueda stated that he would favor continuation of the present commercial use of the property; however, he would be opposed to opening up the possibility of other commercial activities on the site. He requested the staff of the Department of City Planning to confer with the City Attorney's office during the interim.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to take this application under advisement until the meeting of August 2, 1973.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

ABJ

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting meeting held Thursday, July 12, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 12, 1973, at 2:00 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), John Phair, City Planning Coordinator; Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Alec Bash, Planner III; Ronald Jonash, Planner III; Marie Zeller, Planner III - Administrative; Moira So, Planner II; Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II; Gary Craft, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of June 21, 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, began his report by reading the following prepared statement:

"I am pleased to inform you that we have just received notice that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has allocated to the City a grant in the amount of \$143,500 to assist us in the improvement of open space land and recreation facilities.

"The open space land program is a continuation of the former urban beautification program under which the City has received or is eligible to receive \$1,700,137. Including this new grant allocation, it will mean that \$1,843,637 new dollars will have been awarded to the City since 1967-68 for the furtherance of the park improvement and urban beautification program.

"These new funds are to be reinvested in the City's open space and park improvement program. The projects which will be accomplished in part from these funds are:

- "1. Chinese Recreation Center, improvement to children's play area
- "2. Bernal Playground, rehabilitation
- "3. Precita Park, recreation improvements
- "4. Ocean View Playground, improvement to children's play area
- "5. Franklin Square, recreation improvements
- "6. Milton Meyer Recreation Center, recreation improvements
- "7. Garfield Square, recreation improvements
- "8. McKinley Square, improvements to children's play area
- "9. Hunters Point Community Youth Park, develop recreation area"

The Director reported on progress made by the staff in the past two weeks in its efforts to assist the Growth and Development Center to acquire a suitable site in the South Bayshore area. He indicated that the prospects of finding a suitable site appeared to be good.

The Director reminded the Commission that a meeting has been scheduled on Thursday night, July 26, at 7:30 p.m. in Kezar Pavilion for discussion of the final report on the Haight-Ashbury District.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioners Miller and Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed their seats at the Commission table.

The Director advised the Commission that representatives of Saks 5th Avenue had met with the staff to discuss the proposed development of property located on the northeast corner of Post and Powell Streets which is currently occupied by the Fitzhugh Building. He stated that it appeared that the proposed development would require razing the existing building; and he indicated that the staff is preparing Urban Design terms of reference as guidelines for the developer. He also stated that the staff had met with a number of developers who have been interested in Pier 45; and he indicated that the staff is preparing design terms of reference for that area which will reflect the policies of the Northern Waterfront Plan and in the Urban Design Plan.

The Director announced that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors will meet at 7:30 p.m. next Tuesday evening, July 17, in the Board Chambers. The first two items on the agenda will concern rezoning and height limits in Pacific Heights.

R118.73.7 - SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - UTILIZATION OF FAR WEST LABORATORY CONDOMINIUM, 1855 FOLSOM STREET, LOT 18, ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3550.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The subject property was originally constructed as a six-story warehouse with approximately 50,000 square feet per floor, and was occupied for many years by F. W. Woolworth and Company. It was acquired by Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, a joint power created by the Federal Government, State of California and the San Francisco Unified School District. The building was brought into compliance with the Field Act and three floors were remodeled for the Lab's use.

"Far West Laboratory has proposed granting, at no cost, fee title to the second, third, and fourth floors, on a condominium basis, to the San Francisco Unified School District.

"The School District plans to use the space as a staging area while existing schools are brought up to Field Act compliance. Plans for its use after this need is met are not definite, other than it is basically to be used for innovative programs.

"The School District plans to spend \$1.8 million to finish off the second floor. This will provide a school for 500 students. Part of the parking lot space will be utilized as a playground. Approximately half of the parking lot has been used to house Opportunity Junior High School in portable structures. These are currently being removed. It would appear that this space would be sufficient to meet the playground needs and parking for 24 teachers and staff.

"Ultimate development of the full three stories will probably require more parking and/or playground than is available on the site. The School District is considering an elevated playground directly accessible from the second story. Such a structure should be structurally designed so as to be usable for parking if the building use changes.

"The zoning ordinance permits schools in all districts except M-2. This is an M-1 district."

None of the people present in the audience wished to comment on this matter.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that acquisition of the three floors on a condominium basis be approved as having no effect on the Master Plan providing that the Unified School District makes every possible effort to provide additional parking and/or playground space before attempting to utilize the full floor area.

JULY 12, 1973

Commissioner Ritchie stated that this was the first time that he had heard of floors of industrial buildings being sold on a condominium basis; however, he assumed that the Board of Education must have special reasons for using that approach.

No representative of the Board of Education was present.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that action on this matter be deferred until a representative of the Board of Education is present.

Commissioner Miller stated that he would like to have the representative of the Board of Education make comments on the source of the \$1.8 million which would be used to remodel the space which would be used only on a temporary basis.

After further discussion the question was called, and the Commission voted unanimously to postpone action on this matter until such time as a representative of the Board of Education is present. (A representative of the Board of Education appeared in the meeting room later in the meeting; and action was taken on this matter at that time.)

PRESENTATION OF FINAL REPORT ON HAIGHT-ASHBURY DISTRICT

John Phair, City Planning Co-ordinator, and Ronald Jonash, Planner III, presented and summarized the report and responded to questions which were raised by members of the Commission. The report is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

R118.73.7 - SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - UTILIZATION OF FAR WEST LABORATORY CONDOMINIUM, 1855 FOLSOM STREET, LOT 18, ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3550. (Continuation of discussion held earlier in the meeting.)

Larry Jacobson, representing the Board of Education, advised the Commission that the school district is restricted by State law from spending money to improve private property; and, for that reason, the condominium approach had been proposed in the present instance so that the space could be remodeled to meet the Board of Education's needs.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he was concerned about the proposal to spend \$1.8 million to remodel a facility which would be used only temporarily.

Mr. Jacobson stated that a proposed bond issue will include \$1.8 million for new schools in the Mission District; and he indicated that a portion of those funds would be used to remodel the three floors at the Far West Laboratory.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the acquisition on a condominium basis of the second, third, and fourth floors of the building on Lot 18, Block 3550, by the San Francisco Unified School District does not affect the Master Plan, provided that the District makes every possible effort to provide additional parking and/or playground space before attempting to utilize the full floor area.

EE73.23 - REVIEW OF REVISED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR YERBA BUENA
CENTER PUBLIC FACILITIES AND PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JUNE 28, 1973)

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on this matter as follows:

"On July 28, the public hearing of the draft Environmental Impact Report for Yerba Buena Center was concluded, and the draft report was taken under advisement to today, at which time it was anticipated that the Commission could certify completion of the final report. However, the Redevelopment Agency and the City Attorney's office have requested that the review of the final report be rescheduled to July 19.

"As you will recall the City's Environmental Quality Ordinance requires that the revised report be available for public review at least 5 days prior to certification of completion by the Commission. The revised report is now available at the Department of City Planning, and notice to this effect has been posted as required.

"The revised final report consists of the original May 1973 draft report, and an addendum proposed this week which basically contains corrections and additions to the May 1973 draft, appendices including all written comments concerning the report received through July 2 and transcript of the July 14 and July 28 hearings on the report, and a staff synopsis of, and response to, all oral and written comments concerning the report received through July 2.

"Copies of the addendum, excluding the transcript, have been placed before you for your review."

At the conclusion of his report, the Director recommended that this matter be continued under advisement until 3:00 p.m. on July 19, 1973.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that this matter be carried under advisement until the meeting of July 19, 1973, at 3:00 p.m. A standard tape cassette recording of this portion of the Commission's proceedings is available for public review or transcription.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

JULY 12, 1973

EE73.7 - PUBLIC HEARING ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR A 12-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING AT 2044 FRANKLIN STREET, LOT 10A IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 479.

The Commissioner received and responded to comments made by members of the audience. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7041 be adopted with the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does hereby find that the final Environmental Impact Report, dated July 12, 1973, concerning '12-unit building, 3044 Franklin Street,' is adequate, accurate, and does hereby certify the completion of said Report;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission in certifying the completion of said report, does hereby find that the project as proposed will have a significant effect on the environment."

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the offices of the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription.

CU73.25 - 1356 FULTON STREET, NORTH LINE, 220 FEET WEST OF DIVISADERO STREET. REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A BOARD AND CARE HOME FOR 25 MENTALLY DISTURBED PERSONS; IN AN R-3 DISTRICT.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JULY 5, 1973)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the recommendation of the staff during the meeting on July 5 had been that the subject application should be disapproved. However, the Commission had indicated its intention to approve the application for two years and had instructed the staff to prepare a draft resolution of approval with appropriate conditions for adoption during the present meeting. We distributed copies of the draft resolution to members of the Commission and summarized the six conditions which it contained. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the conditions which he was proposing were acceptable to the applicant.

The applicant was not present in the meeting room.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7042 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

CU73.14 - 156-162 GUERRERO STREET, WEST LINE, 105 FEET SOUTH OF CLINTON PARK. REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT FOR 43 CARS TO BE USED AS PART OF THE SERVICE OPERATION OF S & C MOTORS, INC.; IN AN R-4 DISTRICT.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JULY 5, 1973)

JULY 12, 1973

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the recommendation of the staff during the meeting of July 5 had been that the subject application should be disapproved. However, the Commission had indicated its intention to approve the application for a two-year period subject to appropriate conditions; and the Commission had requested that a draft resolution of approval with appropriate conditions be prepared by the staff for consideration during today's meeting. Mr. Steele distributed copies of the draft resolution which had been prepared and summarized the seven conditions which it contained. President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele were acceptable to the applicant.

A representative of S & C Motors replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7043 and that the application be approved for two years subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

ABJ

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 19, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 19, 1973, at 1:45 P.M. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Peter Svirsky, Planner V (Zoning); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Daniel Sullivan, Planner IV (Zoning); Ronald Jonash, Planner III; Marie Zeller, Planner III - Administrative; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; Emily Hill, Planner II; Carl Nes, Planner II; Glenda Skiffer, Planner II; Moira So, Planner II; Linda Ferbert, Planner I; Gary Craft, Planner I; Robin Jones, City Planning Intern; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Bob Bartlett represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Mel Wax represented television station KQED.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of May 31, 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

President Newman called attention to a resolution which had been received from the Assembly Rules Committee of the State Legislature urging the Commission to take all actions necessary and proper to preserve Kite Hill in Eureka Valley Area as open space. After discussion, during which Commissioner Mellon arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be instructed to prepare a letter to be sent in reply suggesting that the concern of the members of the legislative Committee should be directed towards efforts to appropriate State funds for acquisition of this privately-owned property.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reminded members of the Commission of a meeting scheduled next Thursday evening, July 26, at 7:30 P.M. in Kezar Pavilion for discussion of the final Haight-Ashbury Report.

The Director reported on hearings held on Tuesday evening by the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors relative to height limits and rezoning in Pacific Heights.

The Director advised the Commission that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors had requested the Department of City Planning to formulate a preliminary plan for redeveloping the Lincoln Elementary School site for low- to moderate-income housing.

The Director informed the Commission that final recommendations for an annual development program have been transmitted to Mayor Alioto; and he indicated that copies of the recommendations will be mailed to members of the Commission next week.

R73.34 - STREET VACATION - INDIA BASIN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, stated that the Redevelopment Plan for the India Basin Redevelopment Project calls for vacation of all streets between Arthur and Evans Avenues, Third and Jennings Streets except for a portion of Keith Street. He stated that the area will be replanted and that Newhall and Mendell Streets will be realigned. He noted that the Commission had acted on July 13, 1972, to approve vacation of Burke, Custer, and Davidson Avenues east of Mendell; and he indicated that the streets in the western portion of the project could now be vacated because private property acquisition in that area has been completed. He stated that the portion of Keith Street north of the new alignment of Newhall Street would be vacated, also.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the proposed street vacations be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

A representative of the Redevelopment Agency stated that he was present to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission. When asked by Commissioner Fleishhacker if a new street pattern would be established in the area, he replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of streets in the India Basin Redevelopment Project, as indicated on Department of Public Works Map No. SUR-1573, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

R73.8 - REVOCABLE ENCROACHMENT PERMIT - LANDSCAPING, LA PLAYA AND CABRILLO STREETS; LANDSCAPING FOR ANGELO ROSSI PALISADES, BENNY BUFANO PARK, AND LOUIS ETS-HOKIN VILLAGE.

1911

Received of the Treasurer of the University of California the sum of \$100.00 for the year 1911.

This receipt is given in full for the sum of \$100.00 for the year 1911.

Witness my hand and the seal of the University of California at Berkeley, California, this 1st day of January, 1911.

Very truly yours,
The President of the University of California

Attest:
The Secretary of the University of California

By _____
The Treasurer of the University of California

By _____
The Controller of the University of California

By _____
The Registrar of the University of California

By _____
The Librarian of the University of California

By _____
The Director of the University of California

By _____
The Vice-Chancellor of the University of California

By _____
The Dean of the University of California

By _____
The Faculty of the University of California

By _____
The Board of Regents of the University of California

By _____
The Senate of the University of California

By _____
The Trustees of the University of California

By _____
The Officers of the University of California

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), reported on this matter as follows:

"The proposal by Seal Rock Development Company is to construct and maintain landscaping features in La Playa between 380 feet north of Balboa Street and Fulton Street, and in Cabrillo Street between La Playa and the Great Highway, all in conjunction with the construction of Angelo Rossi Palisades, Benny Bufano Park and Louis Ets-Hokin Village. All landscaped areas are to remain open to the public.

"The landscaping treatment of La Playa north of Balboa, presently an underdeveloped steeply sloped street area, would have as its major element the creation of a winding public walkway connection from Balboa to the meadow area of Sutro Heights Park. This walkway has the endorsement of the Recreation and Park Commission. The developer has declared his commitment to complete this landscaping in a manner which will protect significant existing plant materials in this street area and the adjacent park area. The Fire Department has stated this street area need not be paved to provide emergency access to the proposed Angelo Rossi Palisades residences adjacent to the west. Vacant R-3 zoned lots front on the east side of this segment of La Playa; however there appear to be no immediate plans for the development of these lots. At least partial paving of this street area would probably be required when the vacant lots on the east side of the street are developed.

"The section of La Playa between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets, presently a paved street, is proposed to be closed to vehicular traffic. Landscaping includes a public walkway extending the length of the street, and a large pond. A portion of the pond would extend onto Lot 1 in Assessor's Block 1595 owned by the Public Utilities Commission. The General Manager of that Commission has notified the Planning Commission that his office plans to issue a revocable land use permit for this lot to allow the proposed pond and plant materials. Such a permit for the use of Public Utilities Commission land does not require approval by the Board of Supervisors. Except for Lot 1, property on both sides of this segment of La Playa is owned by the Seal Rock Development Company, and is proposed to be developed as the Benny Bufano Park residences. The proposed landscaping would be done in a manner permitting emergency access to the proposed dwellings fronting on this street segment.

"The segment of La Playa between Cabrillo and Fulton Streets, presently a paved street, would have its paved roadway reduced in width to the minimum required to provide access to the existing Safeway parking lot on the east side of the street and the parking or service areas of the proposed Louis Ets-Hokin Village shopping center on the west side of the street, and to provide circulation for public transit vehicles. The remainder of the present street area except for walkways would be planted.

JULY 19, 1973

"On Cabrillo Street the present turn-around for Muni transit vehicles would be retained; however the paved area will be somewhat reduced, and planting materials would be installed on both sides of the street and at the western end of the street segment.

"This proposed treatment of La Playa and Cabrillo was indicated on the site plans of the planned unit development for Angelo Rossi Palisades, Benny Bufano Park, and Louis Ets-Hokin Village authorized by the Planning Commission in December 1972 under Resolution No. 6931, and covered in the Environmental Impact Report concerning the project adopted by the Planning Commission at that time.

"In approving the project proposed by the planned unit development in July 1973 the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission included the condition that prior 'to commencing construction of any portion of the project, applicant shall receive from the City a legally binding commitment for the dedication of whatever development rights are necessary for the conversion of La Playa Street between Balboa and Fulton Streets into a linear park as shown in plans submitted to the (Coastal) Commission'. The Commission further stipulated that landscaping of this street area and the planned unit development be subject to the approval of the City and County of San Francisco and be assured by a 100% improvement bond in favor of the City, which bond shall be provided prior to the construction of any residential units.

"The Planning Commission in Resolution No. 6931 stipulated the following:

"Part or all of La Playa Street, between Balboa Street and Fulton Street may be discontinued as a traffic street and landscaped to create a pedestrian environment, if approval for such plans is obtained from the Board of Supervisors. Such landscaping and alteration of use shall be done in conformity with the following guidelines:

- "a. All street areas and public properties must remain open, continuously, to the public.
- "b. In accordance with plans approved by the Department of City Planning, landscaping, paving and other improvements placed in street areas or on public properties shall be paid for and maintained by the developers of Seal Rock.
- "c. The portion of La Playa Street between Cabrillo and Fulton shall remain open to traffic, but may be narrowed to such extent as approved by the Department of City Planning.

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL ARTICLES	1
REPORTS	1
EDITORIAL	1
DEPARTMENTS	1
SYMPOSIUM	1
BOOK REVIEW	1
NOTES	1
ANNOUNCEMENTS	1
OBITUARY	1
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	1
INDEX	1

CONTENTS (Continued)

ORIGINAL ARTICLES	1
REPORTS	1
EDITORIAL	1
DEPARTMENTS	1
SYMPOSIUM	1
BOOK REVIEW	1
NOTES	1
ANNOUNCEMENTS	1
OBITUARY	1
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	1
INDEX	1

"Only preliminary landscaping plans have been developed to date for the subject street areas. The applicant has indicated his willingness to consult with the Department of City Planning, other appropriate City agencies, and adjacent private property owners in the development of final landscaping plans."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that the proposed use of the street areas would be necessary for a significant public or semi-public use (that of providing a strong pedestrian and non-automobile oriented passageway between Sutro Heights Park and Golden Gate Park) where the nature of the use and character of the development proposed would justify occupying the street rather than some other site. Additionally, the proposed landscaping would permit small-scale pedestrian crossings between portions of the proposed abutting residential and commercial planned unit development. He therefore recommended that issuance of the requested revocable encroachment permit be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan subject to applicable conditions of City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6931.

Commissioner Fleishhacker observed that the public would be permitted only pedestrian access in the two northerly blocks of La Playa; however, in the southerly block both pedestrian and vehicular access to the public would be available.

President Newman asked about a 7500 square foot portion of the property designated as "Open Space" on the maps posted on the wall of the meeting room. Mr. Passmore replied that the California Coastal Zone Commission had required the applicant to reduce the number of dwelling units being proposed and to provide 7500 additional square feet of open space for public use.

President Newman then inquired about the status of the proposed project. Jeremy Ets-Hokin, the applicant, stated that he hoped to obtain financial approval on July 26; and he indicated that he would be prepared to start construction of the project as of that date.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would abstain from voting on the matter under consideration because of a conflict of interest arising from the fact that he is the applicant's agent for leasing the commercial portion of the project.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the issuance of a revocable encroachment permit for installation

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the specific results of the work.

2. The second part of the report deals with the specific results of the work. It is divided into three main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work in the field of agriculture, the second section deals with the results of the work in the field of industry, and the third section deals with the results of the work in the field of commerce.

3. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions of the work. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the conclusions of the work in the field of agriculture, and the second section deals with the conclusions of the work in the field of industry and commerce.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the recommendations of the work. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the recommendations of the work in the field of agriculture, and the second section deals with the recommendations of the work in the field of industry and commerce.

and maintenance of landscaping in La Playa between 380 feet north of Balboa Street and Fulton Street and on Cabrillo Street between La Playa and the Great Highway is in conformity with the Master Plan subject to the applicable conditions of City Planning Resolution No. 6031. Commissioner Ritchie abstained from voting.

CONSIDERATION OF PROGRAMS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN.

George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, and Emily Hill, Planner II, presented the report, summarizing changes for additions which had been made in the document which had previously been submitted to the Commission with the Improvement Plan for Recreation and Open Space in 1972. The revised report is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

Thomas Malloy, representing the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, stated that the revised report would be very useful to his department as it prepares plans and bond issues in the future; and he indicated that they appreciated the sympathetic cooperation of the staff of the Department of City Planning in putting the report together. He felt that it had been wise to separate the program recommendations from the policy section of the Improvement Plan for Recreation and Open Space.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that a chart on Page 93 of the report estimated the total cost of acquiring private property to fulfill the programs contained in the report at approximately 16 million dollars; and, in addition, Page 21 of the report specified that funds in the amount of 10 million dollars have been included in the current State budget for acquisition of land at Candlestick Cove. Therefore, land acquisition costs totalling \$26 million were being contemplated in the report. He also noted that a chart on Page 92 of the report designated the San Francisco Golf Club and the Olympic Country Club for acquisition although no market value was indicated for those properties.

The Director stated that the staff was recommending that the golf course properties be acquired as open space only if the private clubs which presently own them should discontinue the present use of the properties. He stated that the Board of Supervisors, also, had expressed concern about preservation of those properties as open space.

President Newman remarked that the maps of the Northern Waterfront area which were contained in the report had no indication of parks or open space. The Director replied that those features had been shown on maps in the adopted Master Plan element; and he indicated that the staff had attempted to avoid redundancy.

Commissioner Farrell observed that the report contained a recommendation that through automobile traffic should be removed from John F. Kennedy Drive. He indicated that he was in agreement with that policy; however, he wondered what would be done with the traffic.

Mr. Malloy stated that the proposal had been contained in the report as a long-term general objective; and he acknowledged that the objective would not be readily or easily obtainable. He expected that considerable attention would be focused on that issue when a Master Plan is prepared for Golden Gate Park. He emphasized that the proposed policy would not preclude use of John F. Kennedy Drive for slow moving automobile traffic passing through the park for the purpose of enjoyment.

Elaine Sundahl, representing the Waterfront Committee of the Portrero Hill Residents and Homeowners Council and the Portrero Hill Advisory Council, urged the Commission to adopt the implementation programs which were being proposed and to instruct the staff of the Department of City Planning to continue to provide technical assistance to her neighborhood.

Mr. Sullivan, representing the Port Commission, advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning is demanding a fee of \$50 for negative environmental impact declarations; and he felt that the fee should be waived when the Port is making an effort to cooperate and to provide open space.

The Director stated that such fees were established by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors; and he indicated that they are being paid by other operating City departments.

John LaBoyteaux, representing People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, expressed his appreciation to the staff for recognizing the establishment of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and for making certain changes in the report as he had requested.

Vernon Thornton, representing WAPAC, stated that he understood that money for acquisition of private property in pursuit of the programs recommended by the staff might be scarce; however, he hoped that consideration would be given to the priorities which were being recommended by the staff.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7044 be adopted with the following resolves:

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does approve the action programs described in the document entitled 'Recreation and Open Space Program: Recommendations for Carrying Out the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan of San Francisco' dated July, 1973, and judges these programs to constitute appropriate action programs for implementing the newly adopted Recreation and Open Space element of the Comprehensive Plan; and

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106-1000
TEL: (313) 763-7000 FAX: (313) 763-7001
WWW: WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For more information, please contact:
The University of Michigan Library
100 South State Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1000
Tel: (313) 763-7000 Fax: (313) 763-7001

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

For a complete list of our services, please visit our website:
WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does authorize the Director of Planning to take all reasonable steps to attain implementation of the said programs and further authorizes him to make editorial changes in the text of the document toward the end of shortening the document and preparing a final version for public distribution."

At 2:55 P.M. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:05 P.M. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

ZM73.11 - INNER RICHMOND REZONING -- RECLASSIFICATION FROM R-4 AND R-3 TO R-2 AND P (FOR PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES) IN THE AREA GENERALLY BOUNDED BY GEARY AND ARGUELLO BOULEVARDS, FULTON STREET AND FUNSTON AVENUE.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the area under consideration which is comprised of 1,518 lots. Nearly 75% of the parcels are developed with single and two-family dwellings; and only seven of the lots are presently vacant. Mr. Steele stated that the application had been filed in such a way that the Commission, in addition to considering the proposal for reclassification of the properties to R-2, could also consider re-classification to the intermediate categories, R-3 and R3.5. He stated that buildings currently developed to a greater residential density than would be permitted if the property were to be reclassified would become non-complying buildings with respect to the City Planning Code. He emphasized, however, that such non-complying buildings, if destroyed by fire or other calamity, could be rebuilt if reconstruction were to begin within one year of the disaster.

Commissioner Fleishhacker inquired about the height limits in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Steele replied that all of the properties included in the application are subject to a 40-foot height limit.

Commissioner Rueda asked if a non-complying building could be reconstructed after a disaster if it had been sold and it were no longer owned by the person who owned it at the time of the reclassification. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative.

In reply to a series of questions raised by Commissioner Ritchie, Mr. Steele stated that the 1,518 parcels included in the subject application have a total area of approximately 44½ acres and house between 20,000 and 30,000 people, 61% of whom are owner-occupants.

President Newman advised the audience that members of the Commission had taken a field trip to the subject neighborhood and had visited every block included in the application.

Received of the Treasurer of the United States
the sum of \$100.00 for the year 1914

and of the sum of \$100.00 for the year 1915

for the year 1916

for the year 1917

for the year 1918

for the year 1919

for the year 1920

for the year 1921

for the year 1922

for the year 1923

for the year 1924

for the year 1925

for the year 1926

for the year 1927

Jeanne Hinesley, 573 - 7th Avenue, stated that 1970 census data indicates that 11,620 people live within the area included within the subject application. She remarked that the application covers approximately 42 City blocks which have a total of more than 1500 individual parcels of property; and she felt that it was clear that the citizens who had filed the application could not possibly have given consideration to the area on a lot-by-lot basis. Their intent had been to rezone as much of the area as possible to R-2; however, they would be able to understand if the Commission were to take the position that areas which are already developed to R-3 standards, such as Arguello Boulevard between Geary and Anza Street, should be zoned R-3 rather than R-2. In other words, the intent of the application was to request the help of the staff of the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission in looking at the neighborhood to determine what zoning would be most appropriate and reasonable for the neighborhood and for the good of San Francisco as a whole. However, while the applicants did not feel that they were equipped to study the situation in the same depth as the Department of City Planning, they felt that they could give the Commission some guidelines based on their knowledge of what they do and do not like in the way of neighborhoods. She stated that residents of the subject neighborhood wished to have their area rezoned to R-2 for many of the same reasons that residents of the Mountain Lake Park area had requested reclassification of their properties; and she remarked that the two neighborhoods share a number of similarities. Seventy-five percent of the buildings in the area are single-family homes or buildings with two flats; and only 25% of the properties are developed with apartment buildings. The neighborhood is a good place for families with children; and 25% of the population of the area is under 18 years of age. On the other hand, the neighborhood is a good place for older people; and 15% of the population is older than 65 years of age. Like residents of the Mountain Lake Community, the applicants regret seeing fine old homes demolished; and they felt that the new apartment buildings which are being constructed are ugly, that they rent for too much money, that they decrease the amount of open space available, and that they increase parking congestion. Unlike the Mountain Lake community, the subject neighborhood has a lot of absentee owners and a lot more renters, many of whom are families with children. The subject neighborhood has more working people than the Mountain Lake community; and the average income of the area, between 9,000 and 11,000 dollars, is lower than the middle-income range of the other neighborhood. Homes in the subject neighborhood are not as expensive as those in the other neighborhood. Twenty percent of the homes are valued at under \$25,000; and 43% of the homes range in value from \$25,000 to \$35,000. The subject neighborhood has a diversity of people, 40% of whom are foreign born; and certain people, such as the Chinese, are using the neighborhood as a stepping-stone from Chinatown to better residential areas. Historically, rezoning has been used to segregate communities; but she emphasized that that was not the purpose of the subject application. In fact, the purpose of the application was to preserve the neighborhood in its present diverse form.

Mrs. Hinesley informed the Commission that three single family homes had been torn down and replaced by three apartment buildings in her block within an eight month period. During the construction process, the neighborhood had been subjected

to dirt, congestion, noise, and parking problems. However, what was worse was that the neighborhood had lost three families with seven children who lived in the houses which had been torn down; and, in addition, the loss of three other families might be related indirectly to the fact that the single-family buildings had been replaced. Only one child lives in the new apartment buildings. The new buildings have reduced the amount of open space available in the area; and, since the families whom she had known had been replaced by 25 people that she does not know, she has less of a feeling of security. In addition, more automobiles are crossing the sidewalk and endangering children who play in the area. She and other residents of the neighborhood had discussed what they could do about the situation and had decided to make an effort to have the neighborhood rezoned. They knew that the job would not be easy. They had published a small newspaper; and then they had begun to take a petition from door to door, contacting all residents of the area whether they are property owners or not. A total of 600 signatures had been obtained; and while many others had seemed to favor the proposal for rezoning, they had declined to sign the petition for one reason or another. Before the campaign was started, the neighborhood was not represented by a well-organized or identifiable association; however, as a side effect of the efforts which had been made in behalf of the rezoning, a "community" was emerging. In conclusion, she stated that she hoped that the new-born sense of community would continue to develop in the future.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had requested the staff to recompute the total acreage of the subject properties; and he indicated that Mr. Steele had confirmed that the total area of the properties is approximately 120 acres rather than the 44½ acres which had been reported previously.

Arden Danekas, President of Planning Area for the Richmond, (PAR), summarized the principles and policies of his organization and indicated his support of the request for rezoning. He observed that the neighborhood contains a diverse mixture of working people living in houses or apartments which rent for as little as \$75 a month in some cases. He stated that approximately 90% of the people with whom he had talked about the subject application had been in favor of the proposal; however, many of them had felt that City Hall is too remote, that the concerns of the working man are not represented in the local governmental machinery, or for similar reasons. He emphasized that residents of the subject neighborhood want protection against additional apartment buildings; and he urged that the Commission respond to their concern by approving the subject application.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had received a number of letters from people who favored reclassification to R-2 but who specified that they also wished to have public housing in the area; and she questioned whether it would be possible to develop public housing in an R-2 district.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that a small public housing project has been constructed in an R-1 District at Ocean Beach. Under the circumstances, the ability to develop public housing did not seem to be affected by zoning.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry must be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. The second part outlines the procedures for handling discrepancies between the books and the actual cash on hand. It states that any variance must be investigated immediately and reported to the management. The third part describes the process for reconciling the bank statements with the company's records. It notes that this should be done monthly to ensure that the company's financial position is always up-to-date. The fourth part discusses the need for regular audits to verify the accuracy of the accounting system. It mentions that these audits should be conducted by an independent party to ensure objectivity. The fifth part concludes by stating that the company's financial records are a key indicator of its overall health and performance. It encourages all employees to take responsibility for the accuracy of their entries and to report any errors or irregularities promptly.

The following table provides a summary of the company's financial performance for the first quarter of 2023. It includes data on revenue, expenses, and net income. The revenue section shows a steady increase in sales across all product lines, with a particular focus on the new product launch. The expenses section details the costs associated with production, marketing, and administrative functions. The net income section shows a positive trend, indicating that the company is effectively managing its costs while maintaining high-quality standards. The table also includes a breakdown of the data by region, allowing for a comparison of performance across different markets. The overall conclusion is that the company has achieved significant growth and is well-positioned for continued success in the coming year.

The document concludes with a statement of appreciation for the hard work and dedication of all employees. It expresses confidence in the company's future and encourages everyone to continue striving for excellence. The final section provides contact information for the accounting department and a reminder to keep all financial records secure and confidential. The document is signed by the Chief Financial Officer and dated the 15th of March, 2023.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how many people had refused to sign the petition which had been distributed by Mr. Danekas because they felt that City Hall would be unresponsive to their concern. Mr. Danekas replied that he had circulated a petition in two blocks, had obtained approximately 50 signatures in support of the requested reclassification, and had been advised by 10 or 12 people that they did not wish to sign the petition because they doubted that the local government would do anything about the matter.

Ethel Laub, 682 Fourth Avenue, read the following prepared statement:

"I represent Richmond Environment Action, an association of 3,000 families and individuals concerned with the environment in which we live. Many of our members reside in the GAFF, myself included. The GAFF, and, indeed, the whole Richmond Dist., face an uncertain future unless steps are taken to preserve this as a family neighborhood. You might be interested to know, as we are, that according to the Planning Dept. Housing Report of 1971, there were more one-family homes demolished in our district in 1971 than any other section of the city--34 in number. We were in 4th place in the demolition of two-family units in S.F.--24 buildings. There were 268 buildings of 4 units each completed in S.F. that year -- 135 of them in the Richmond, more than any other area, and 22 of those in the GAFF. Since then, in the last two years, Arguello Blvd., from Fulton to Calif. (five blocks), has seen its dwellings increased to seven times their number by the spate of plastic cubicle building.

"Ours is a community of people of all races, religions, ages, economic brackets, and life styles. This diversity seems to produce a dynamic, energetic and constructive force in our city. Its spirit has given rise to, among other things, the Richmond Complex, the first, completely voluntary desegregation of elementary schools in S.F., planned, initiated and carried out by many parents in our area one year ahead of the rest of the city. It is also the home of our organization, the largest and the oldest recycling operation in the city. We enjoy the environment provided here--the integration of the diverse elements affords our residents a unique, vital sense of community, which should be preserved.

"Young families with children, for the most part, cannot afford the high rents charged in the new multiple units going up. We don't want them forced to move out of the city to raise their young. We don't want a sterile corridor of stucco boxes occupied by transient childless people on their way to somewhere else. We are dreadfully concerned about the problems of overcrowding, alienation, pollution, traffic and parking problems, the taxing of the city's services in this area, and all the other attendant miseries of uncontrolled building by people who shrug off the consequences of their quick profit ventures and leave us to deal with them. We value the fine old buildings which attest to the unique traditions of S.F. They help develop

in us and our children a sense of stability, balance and continuity, and our place in history. They are witness to the importance of the individual and a decent set of values.

"One of our members said that quantity is replacing quality--- that today we have only time and money to erect monuments of plaster-board. We ask you to prove today that that is not the case. Just Tues. evening the Supervisors Planning and Development Comm. agreed that rezoning to R-2 was desirable and necessary for Pacific Heights. An area very near the GAFF was very recently down-zoned also. One after another the various neighborhoods of the city are speaking out against unplanned, uncontrolled ravaging construction. We know people need jobs and that the city can't stand still in time. We propose, however, that instead of the mindless rush to build anything at all, we use our workers and resources to preserve, repair and improve the existing buildings of value in our neighborhoods. REA entreats you to rezone the GAFF to R-2 to protect and preserve our neighborhood."

Allen Rosenberg, Chairman of the Planning Committee of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association (SPUR), supported the proposed "downzoning". He stated that the neighborhood has a particular quality because its residents have a certain life-style. Construction of new R-3 buildings with no setbacks, with long curb cuts, and with more people, violates that life-style and generates a situation in which middle class is encouraged to move to the suburbs.

Sister Irene Lawrence felt that it was important that the subject neighborhood should retain its family residential character; and she believed that reclassification to R-2 would achieve that end while also preserving the diversity of the area.

Mr. Stark, President of the Jordan Park Improvement Association, indicated his support for the reclassification to R-2.

Tony Kilroy, representing the Board of Directors of San Francisco Tomorrow, stated that his board had voted unanimously to adopt a resolution favoring the requested rezoning. He stated that he owns property at 473 11th Avenue; and, in a recent survey of his block, he had determined that approximately 90% of the resident property owners were in favor of the rezoning. Of those whom he had surveyed, 73% had signed petitions in favor of the rezoning, 17% had been unavailable, 3% had stated that they would prefer to come to the hearing for themselves, and only 7% had refused to sign, stating that it was their general practice not to sign petitions. Under the circumstances he felt that his estimate of 90% in favor of the reclassification was fairly accurate. He stated that one property owner in the area had recently purchased an additional lot, indicating that he planned to construct a new two-unit building. However, he feared that an apartment house might be built on the site; and, if so, he would be deprived of most of the view which he presently enjoys. Therefore, he personally supported the request for rezoning.

Mrs. Lew, 459 - 4th Avenue, stated that she was in favor of R-2 zoning so that the multi-ethnic character of the neighborhood could be preserved.

Don Ziegler stated that he and his wife rent an apartment on Arguello Boulevard. Since moving into the area, they had grown fond of the Richmond District and have looked forward to buying a home in the area. However, as long as the zoning of the area permits construction of apartment buildings next door to single-family residences, he would be reluctant to buy a house of his own. He stated that apartment dwellers are transient people; and, as a case in point, he indicated that he and his wife are the longest-term residents of their six-unit apartment building inspite of the fact that they have only lived there only 1½ years. Most people have remained in the building only 4 or 5 months before moving into the suburbs. The things which he particularly likes about the Richmond District are Clement Street, the neighborhoods proximity to Golden Gate Park; and the character of the people who reside in the area; and he hoped that the Commission would rezone the area to R-2 so that its present character could be retained. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. Ziegler stated that he had previously lived in Mill Valley and in Oregon where apartment living is quite different than it is in San Francisco.

Roger Bernhardt, owner of property in the 600 block of 9th Avenue, stated that he had moved to the Richmond District from the Sunnyside District because it had apartments and because there were more children in the Richmond area; however, with the construction of large new apartment buildings which attract tenants without children, the character of the area was beginning to change. Some of the newer apartments rent for \$300 per month; and he indicated that that is more than he pays against his mortgage each month. He stated that he had undertaken a survey of his block; and he submitted a map which he had prepared to indicate whether the owners or tenants who had been contacted were in favor of the application. He also noted that the urban design plan refers to "residents" and not to "property owners"; and he indicated that he, also, was of the opinion that residents do care about their neighborhood as much as property owners. He stated that there are two ways to view neighborhoods such as the Richmond District. One is to view it as a good place to raise children; and the second way is to view it as an area in which to make money. He did not feel that the Department of City Planning should be controlled by the motive of improving property values; and, as a result, he felt that the subject application should be approved.

James Henesy, stated that he, his wife, and their two children are tenants of property located on 6th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets. He indicated that other neighborhoods of San Francisco do not have the type of places which he could afford or which he would enjoy living in. In the subject neighborhood, however, there is a great mixture of ages, racial types, and an interesting variety of people. He remarked that apartment buildings are having difficulties finding tenants; however, when flats are available, they are usually taken immediately. If the flats are not preserved, San Francisco will no longer have rental units for families; and, for that reason, he urged that the subject application be approved.

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

Irene O'Neal stated that she had lived in the subject neighborhood for 15 years without experiencing any problems. However, last year her teenage son was mauled by a group of assailants who are residents of one of the new apartment complexes in the area. Under the circumstances, it was obvious to her that the new apartment buildings are changing the character of the neighborhood.

Paul Able, 534 - 8th Avenue, stated that a new apartment building located to his home is ruining his property. Every time sewers in the building stop up, the drainage flows into his yard; and, when the building was constructed, he had to spend \$2,000 to install skylights in his home. Because his bedroom is located next to the apartment building, he finds it impossible to sleep on weekends when occupants of the apartment house are giving parties.

Sam Goldblatt, 2908 Fulton Street, noted that a FACE program had been completed in the subject neighborhood; and he advised the Commission that he had been faced with a decision as to whether he should demolish his building or bring it up to code standards. He had finally decided to bring the building up to code standards; and the remodeling project had cost him \$60,000. He had spent that money with confidence that the zoning of his property would remain unchanged. If he had known that the subject application would be filed, he would have demolished the building. He stated that Fulton Street, between 5th and 8th Avenues, is developed predominantly with apartment buildings; and, insofar as the character of the buildings will not change, he questioned the propriety of changing the zoning of the properties.

Bill Worthington, owner of property on Cabrillo Street between 5th and 6th Avenues, felt that the neighborhood had improved as virtual shacks were replaced with new apartment units; and, with improvement of the appearance of the neighborhood, the economy of the City had improved, also. He stated that an old shack without an off-street parking space had existed across the street from his property; and he was pleased that it had been replaced with a new three unit apartment building with three off-street parking spaces. Yet, he indicated that he does not like "cracker boxes"; and he suggested that some control must be exercised over the quality of the new apartment buildings. While many of the buildings in the Inner Richmond District may have the appearance of one or two family dwellings, a large number of them have been converted illegally into four or five dwelling units for which no off-street parking spaces have been provided; and he felt that the requested "downzoning", by placing additional restrictions on new development, would constitute a step backwards. At the same time, there are many substantial older buildings in the Richmond District; and he was confident that they would be preserved even if the zoning were to remain unchanged. He felt that the proponents of the subject application were well intentioned; however, he believed that they were taking the wrong approach towards solving the problems of the area.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Worthington if he is a developer. Mr. Worthington replied in the negative and indicated that he used to be active in the Planning Area for the Richmond (PAR).

10/10/1964

MEMO

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, NEW YORK
SUBJECT: [Illegible]

Re New York letter to Bureau dated 10/10/64, captioned as above.

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

Commissioner Farrell asked if the tenants of the property located across the street from Mr. Worthington were better before or after the new building was constructed. Mr. Worthington replied that the tenants of both buildings were similar.

Richard Kline, owner of property in the area and the founding president of the Planning Area for the Richmond (PAR), stated that he did not believe that he did not believe that development for development's sake is necessarily a good thing; and he reminded the Commission that he had opposed development of the Municipal Railway car barn site at Geary and Masonic Avenues. He also stated that he had worked for the FACE program in the Inner Richmond Area. Yet, as a developer, he was proud of the buildings which he has constructed which contain 4 units with two bedrooms each for families. Since the cost of taxes on the buildings exceeds \$3,000 per year, occupants of the buildings must have a middle-class income. During the FACE program, buildings which were not suitable for rehabilitation were demolished while sounder structures were rejuvenated. The area was also concerned with urban amenities such as "mom and pop" grocery stores; however, because of the provisions of the City Planning Code, those stores would be forced out of business in 1980. He felt that an audience of the size of the one present was indicative of the fact that people are not aware of or concerned about the problems of their neighborhood. They do not fight; but when they become disgusted with the neighborhood, they move to the suburbs. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. Kline stated that the two-bedroom, two-bath apartments in his four-unit buildings rent at a monthly rate of \$285.

Ron Wimberley, representing a realty firm located at 20th Avenue and Clement, stated that he had lived in the Richmond District for six years. He stated that he was opposed to the proposed rezoning; however, while he had no statement to make, he did have questions which he wished to raise. He indicated that he had once been a member of PAR and had found that that organization had a very poor ethnic breakdown; and he wondered about the ethnic breakdown of the people who were in favor of the proposed "down-zoning". The medium income of the subject neighborhood ranges from \$9,000 to \$11,000; and the average apartment in the area rents for \$250 to \$270, or for approximately \$3,000 per year; and he questioned how many people at the medium-income level could purchase a \$40,000 home and still keep their annual housing expense at the \$3,000 level. One of the individuals who had spoken in favor of the application had indicated that he would lose the view which he presently enjoys if the request for rezoning were not approved; however, he believed that such a situation would develop only if all of the buildings in the block were to be replaced. He felt that reclassification would lower the resale value of properties in the area; however, a change in zoning would not necessarily bring about a change in assessed value. Under the circumstances, the only people who would benefit from the change of zone would be new purchasers of properties in the area who could petition for a reassessment.

Commissioner Rueda asked Mr. Wimberley if he could recall the lowest recent selling price of a home or flat in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Wimberley replied that homes are selling in excess of \$34,000 and that flats sell for between \$60,000 and \$75,000.

Dan O'Neill, a builder, stated that some of his apartment buildings have tenants who have lived there for as long as six or seven years. He stated that he has purchased a parcel of property at 3rd Avenue and Balboa Street which was previously occupied by a gasoline service station. The property is zoned R-4; and, on the basis of that zoning, nine dwelling units could be constructed under a 40-foot height limit. He had submitted plans for the new building to the Department of City Planning two months ago; however, because filing of the subject application had brought a moratorium into effect, the plans had not been processed. At the present time, he would be prepared to reduce the number of dwelling units in the proposed building to eight, retaining the nine off-street parking spaces which had originally been proposed. He stated that he had been contacted by the City at least 10 times to clean up the garbage which had been dumped on the vacant lot. While he was neither in favor of nor opposed to the requested "down-zoning", he was anxious to proceed with construction of his new building.

Tom Nicholson stated that his family owns 12 flats in two buildings at 7th Avenue and Anza Street which were constructed by his grandparents in 1910. He felt that the proposed rezoning would lower the value of the property owned by his family; and, if the application were to be approved, he felt that a provision should be made to permit buildings having more than 2 units to be replaced even if no natural disaster should occur.

Alice Barkley, representing Chinatown Relocation Services, stated that many Chinese immigrant families are moving to the Richmond District; however, since most of them do not have enough money for a down-payment on property, they must become renters. Under the circumstances, she wondered if the proposed change of zone would raise property values in the area and if it would increase the rent of existing rental units. She stated that she did not wish to take a position regarding the application; however, she felt that she should be able to answer the questions which are being raised in the Chinese community.

Travis Campbell, owner of property in the subject neighborhood, asked what the proposed rezoning would do to property values in the area. He also wondered what is wrong with making money. He pointed out that new apartment buildings are required to have off-street parking spaces; and he noted that older buildings in the area either have no off-street parking spaces or have garage doors which are too narrow to accommodate modern automobiles. He remarked that new development depends upon investors whose willingness to make funds available depends upon integrity in zoning; and he wondered what effect approval of the proposed reclassification would have on the availability of financing for new development in the future.

Edith Hedlund, 438 - 8th Avenue, stated that her block has a considerable amount of diversity, including a new four-unit apartment building. Residents of the area are not wealthy. She stated that she is a retired working girl; and she indicated that she had purchased her property 15 years ago. Under the circumstances, if there were a possibility for increase of property values in the area, she would like to be able to realize the increase. She advised the Commission

that a number of residents of her block had stated that they were opposed to the subject application; and, while some of those people had not been able to be present at the hearing, she had been authorized by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Inouye, Frances Piazza, and Duilia Consulter, property owners in the block, to express their opposition to the proposal. She remarked that we live in a period of change. Many people want to enjoy San Francisco's natural air conditioning; and apartments provide an opportunity for more people to take advantage of the climate. She stated that she had opposed retention of the old R-3 zoning which resulted in most undesirable buildings, particularly on double-frontage lots; however, now that the standards of the R-3 zoning district had been changed, she saw no need for reclassifying R-3 properties to R-2.

Enid Berger, representing the real estate firm of Green & Kaufmann, stated that she had recently sold an R-3 lot in the Richmond District for \$32,000. The property was occupied by a four-room cottage which was clean but which was dilapidated and an obvious fire hazard. The owners of the property had intended to construct a new four-unit apartment building; however, if the property were to be rezoned, their investment would be endangered. In conclusion, she stated that property owners will be required to pay higher taxes if properties continue to be "down zoned".

The Director emphasized that the applicants had been reasonable in their request. They had not demanded that the area be rezoned; rather, they had requested that the Department of City Planning to take a look at the area and to determine where it would be appropriate to reclassify properties from R-4 or R-3 to R-2. He stated that he had taken several field trips to the area; and he indicated that he could not help but observe the clear-cut nature of the difference in character and maintenance between areas zoned R-1 and R-2 and those zoned for multiple dwellings. In fact, the difference between zoning districts had been almost observable even without a zoning map. He had also noted that there seemed to be a significant number of minority children, primarily oriental, around some of the multi-unit buildings; and, as a result, it appeared that the ability of minorities to find family units in four to six unit buildings in certain cases is operative, indicating that not all apartment buildings bring about a non-family situation. Miss Barkley had asked whether there is a direct relationship between rezoning and property values. In reply, he stated that there had appeared to be no relationship between property values and zoning in the Haight-Ashbury District. In the Pacific Heights area, however, property values seemed to be directly related to zoning insofar as properties with less restrictive zoning seemed to have the highest assessed value. With regard to the effect of zoning on rental rates, he remarked that those rates seemed to be based on a combination of what the market will bear and the satisfaction of property owners with their tenants. In that regard, he felt that it was interesting that rental rates in completed FACE areas have not risen proportionately with rental rates in the City as a whole.

The Director then offered his recommendations to the Commission, as follows:

"I recommend that the application be approved in part and disapproved in part based on detailed studies of the area which have been undertaken by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

- "1. Master Plan policies in both the Improvement Plan for Residence and the Urban Design Plan call for conservation of existing neighborhoods and the existing housing stock. The existing housing which is in good condition should be maintained, and most of the structures in the subject area fall into this category.
- "2. Most of the area is characterized by one- and two-family dwellings, however certain specific areas in the neighborhood are in fact, characterized by multifamily development.
- "3. Reclassification at the areas characterized by one- and two-family development to R-2 would affirm the City's commitment to widening the choice of housing stock.

"The recommendation, therefore, is the application be approved for most of the properties in the area with the following exceptions:

"Retain R-4 zoning (Fulton Street frontage between
6th and 8th Avenue and Arguello
Boulevard)

"Fulton Street is referred to in the Transportation Element of the Master Plan as a major thoroughfare and as such can accommodate higher residential densities not necessarily of family character. R-4 zoning is appropriate on this part of Fulton Street.

"The area on Fulton Street recommended for retention of R-4 zoning occur at Arguello, 6th and 8th Avenues. These streets provide vehicular access to Golden Gate Park and are therefore appropriate areas for high density residential development as recommended by the Urban Design Plan guidelines for high density development adjoining parks.

"The demand for new housing in the city has resulted in much recent construction at R-4 intensity or Arguello Boulevard. The residential character on Arguello has changed since 1960 from medium density to high density.

"Retain R-3 zoning (Areas adjacent to Geary Boulevard and vicinity of French Hospital)

"Geary Boulevard is both a major traffic corridor carrying heavy morning and afternoon traffic, and a community business district. The Geary commercial district generates mid-afternoon traffic. The area south of Geary can accommodate higher density development not necessarily of family character. Sixth Avenue and Geary are the crossroads of major Muni lines.

"French Hospital, a major medical facility, on Geary between Fifth and Sixth, is in the middle of this area. The presence of the hospital increases traffic in the area and makes the area amenable to higher densities. With higher densities the area can provide convenient housing to people working in the hospital complex.

"R-3 will allow higher densities on streets whose character is amenable to high densities.

"R-3 zoning would permit conversions thereby retaining existing development and character.

"R-3 zoning would permit new construction of residential units, but at a scale compatible with the bulk and lot coverage development.

"A lower zone than R-3 would produce too many non-complying dwellings and would deny a substantial property right to owners of property which is complying at lower zoning.

"Retain R-3 zoning (8th, 9th, 10th Avenues between Balboa and Cabrillo)

"Housing stock in this area generally appears not to be in as good condition as other portions of the area proposed for rezoning. R-3 zoning would permit new construction where appropriate. Additionally, much of the existing development in this area is already at R-3 density.

"Rezone from R-3 to P (441 - 12th Avenue - Firehouse)
(451 - 6th Avenue - Police Station)
(Frank McCoppin Elementary School)

"These three lots are presently in public use. Designation of the properties as P districts assures that the land will remain in some form of public use, including open space."

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Board of Directors of the
University of California
has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of the report of the
Board of Regents of the
University of California
for the year 1914-1915.

The Director's recommendations were reflected on a map which was posted on the wall of the meeting room; and, in addition, smaller-scale maps reflecting the recommendations were distributed to members of the audience. The Director observed that the nature of his recommendation was somewhat complicated; and, under the circumstances, he suggested that the matter should be taken under advisement until the Commission's meeting on August 9 to enable residents of the neighborhood, as well as the members of the Commission, to study his proposal.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that this matter be taken under advisement until the Commission's meeting on August 9, 1973, at 3:00 P.M.

At 5:05 P.M. President Newman announced a 5-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 5:15 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

EE73.23 - CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR YERBA BUENA
CENTER PUBLIC FACILITIES AND PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT FROM MEETING OF JULY 12, 1973)

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Redevelopment Agency had agreed to permit the staff of the Department of City Planning to participate in the review of specific proposals for development of private parcels of property within the Yerba Buena Center. In such reviews, the concern of the staff of the Department of City Planning will be directed towards implementation of the Urban Design Plan. The staff will not be involved in the review of public developments in the project area because the Art Commission has jurisdiction over the design of public buildings.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried 6 - 1 that the draft resolution which had been prepared by the Director of Planning be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7005. Commissioners Farrell, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Newman, Porter, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No". The resolution contained the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does hereby find that the Final Environmental Impact Report consisting of the May, 1973, draft, the July, 1973 addendum, and the Gryziec letter of July 5, 1973, with responses concerning 'Yerba Buena Center, Public Facilities and Private Development' is adequate, accurate and objective and does hereby CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said Report;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission in certifying the completion of said Report does hereby find that the project as proposed will not have a significant effect on the environment."

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription. In addition, a transcript of the proceedings has been prepared for the Redevelopment Agency by a court reporter.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

copy

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting, held Thursday, July 26, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 26, 1973, at 7:30 P.M. in Kezar Pavilion.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; John C. Farrell and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; John Phair, City Planning Coordinator; Lucian Blazej, City Planning Coordinator; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning); Ronald Jonash, Planner III; Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Emily Hill, Planner II; Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II; Linda Ferbert, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

PRESENTATION OF FINAL HAIGHT-ASHBURY REPORT TO RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITY.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, John Phair, City Planning Coordinator, and Ronald Jonash, Planner III, presented and summarized the final Haight-Ashbury Report which had already been mailed to all residents of the district.

President Newman then called on members of the audience who indicated a desire to address the Commission. Some of the comments and questions which were received covered the following points:

1. The University of California Medical Center should have a pedestrian overpass or underpass across Parnassus Avenue.

2. Support was expressed for Housing Policy No. 2 calling for provision of assistance for conversion to cooperative and condominium ownership and for Transportation Policies 1 and 2 which are aimed at protecting residential areas from excessive automobile traffic. The speaker agreed with the recommendation that hospitals and universities should not expand beyond their present landholdings or beyond their presently approved Master Plans; however, the speaker wondered whether the term "approved Master Plan" referred to a plan which has been approved by the City Planning Commission or if it merely referred to a plan which has been approved by the governing body of an institution. During the staff presentation at the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Jonash stated that some of the hospitals and universities had issued public statements to the effect that no further expansion was contemplated. Where can those statements be seen?

THE [illegible] [illegible]

[The following text is extremely faint and largely illegible. It appears to be a multi-paragraph document, possibly a letter or a report, with several lines of text per paragraph. The content is too blurry to transcribe accurately.]

3. Merchants on Haight Street should be made to realize the important role they play in the Haight-Ashbury community; and they should be encouraged to take the bars down from the front of their shops. Non-resident property owners should help to clean up the area.

4. How were the boundaries chosen for the proposed Upper Ashbury Rehabilitation Assistance Program and why was the lower Haight-Ashbury district excluded from those boundaries?

5. What Charter provision allows the Board of Supervisors to use tax revenues as financial support for the proposed Rehabilitation Assistance Program?

6. The public facilities located in the area, namely the hospitals and the universities, do not serve the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood. Furthermore, no cultural services are offered in the neighborhood. The Haight Theater should be reopened, even if it shows only Doris Day films. The staff of the Department of City Planning made recommendations to reduce automobile traffic in the neighborhood; but they overlooked the fact that the area is a middle-class neighborhood where people rely on their automobiles. If public transit were more convenient, if it ran on time, and if it were safe and clean, people might be more willing to use it.

7. While the staff of the Department of City Planning might consider young, single people to be undesirable, such people still need a place to live and work. If a code enforcement program were to be undertaken in the neighborhood, rents would inevitably be raised and people would be forced out of the neighborhood just as they were forced out of the Western Addition into the Haight-Ashbury district by redevelopment activities. The staff of the Department of City Planning have also recommended that the amount of parking space at Kezar Stadium should be reduced; however, when events are held at the stadium, it is impossible to park in the neighborhood. The man who owns property at Cole and Frederick Streets would like to use his property for a parking lot; however, the Department of City Planning has indicated that it will not allow such a use because of the zoning of the site. The staff report remarked that the number of customers currently shopping on Haight Street will support little more than about three and one half blocks of retail activity; and, if that is the case, I feel that the commercial district on Haight Street should be limited to three and one half blocks rather than the six blocks now included in the district.

8. Most of the people in the audience are on welfare and do not patronize the businesses on Haight Street. The main purpose the street serves for them is as a meeting place.

9. Better access should be provided to the police station in Golden Gate Park; however, the police station should not be relocated. Park Emergency Hospital should not be disturbed. The Municipal Railway subway should not be extended from the West Portal of the Sunset Tunnel to Ninth Avenue. No additional buses should be permitted in the area. The University of California Medical Center should be required to provide more parking.

10. Any new bus routes through the area in the future should be electric and not diesel; and that same general policy should extend to all residential areas of the City. Since many people north of Haight Street live in sub-standard dwellings, that area should not have been excluded from the staff's recommendation for a

Published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

Entered as second-class matter, May 2, 1902, under post office number 383, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement of post office and postmaster. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918. Postpaid.

Copyright, 1917, by American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The Association was organized in 1847, and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in the United States. It is a non-profit corporation, and its funds are used for the promotion of the interests of the medical profession and the public. The Association publishes the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is one of the most important and influential medical journals in the world. The Journal is published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a publication of the American Medical Association, which is a non-profit corporation. The Association was organized in 1847, and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in the United States. It is a non-profit corporation, and its funds are used for the promotion of the interests of the medical profession and the public. The Association publishes the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is one of the most important and influential medical journals in the world. The Journal is published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a publication of the American Medical Association, which is a non-profit corporation. The Association was organized in 1847, and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in the United States. It is a non-profit corporation, and its funds are used for the promotion of the interests of the medical profession and the public. The Association publishes the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is one of the most important and influential medical journals in the world. The Journal is published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a publication of the American Medical Association, which is a non-profit corporation. The Association was organized in 1847, and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in the United States. It is a non-profit corporation, and its funds are used for the promotion of the interests of the medical profession and the public. The Association publishes the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is one of the most important and influential medical journals in the world. The Journal is published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a publication of the American Medical Association, which is a non-profit corporation. The Association was organized in 1847, and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in the United States. It is a non-profit corporation, and its funds are used for the promotion of the interests of the medical profession and the public. The Association publishes the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is one of the most important and influential medical journals in the world. The Journal is published weekly, except during the months of December and January, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1917 is \$5.00 in advance.

Rehabilitation Assistance Program. In any case, owners of sub-standard structures should be required to improve their buildings; and they should not be allowed to make substantial profits without adding improvements to their properties.

11. The primary function of the Haight Street commercial district should be to serve residents of the neighborhood, particularly those people who do not drive. The profit motive should be only a secondary consideration. The same thing should be true of hospitals located in the area.

12. The staff report did not focus enough attention on the rights of tenants.

13. More than fifty percent of the residents of the area are renters; and the housing policies which have been formulated by the staff of the Department of City Planning do not focus on the needs of that majority of the residents.

14. Instead of recommending that future growth of hospitals in the area should be limited to present landholdings or to approved master plans, the staff should have recommended that future growth of hospitals in the area should be prevented.

15. The report which has been presented by the staff of the Department of City Planning was not really a "plan" and represents only a piecemeal study. The report fails to mention neighborhood organizations or to credit their efforts. The recommendations contained in the report are too far removed from the reality of the neighborhood.

16. The staff's proposals to avoid over-concentration of drug rehabilitation program centers and other similar uses in the neighborhood are good recommendations. The same is true of the proposal for development of a cultural center in the Haight Theater.

17. What is the Department of City Planning?

18. The report states that the estimated cost per unit for code enforcement will be approximately \$1,500. Can this debt be paid off on a monthly basis?

19. Instead of proposing a Rehabilitation Assistance Program for the upper Ashbury district and suggesting the possibility for a similar program in the lower Haight-Ashbury district in the future, why not propose a single program covering the entire neighborhood in two phases?

20. The staff report recommends that the intersection of Central Avenue and Fulton Street should be improved; and a map which was displayed by the staff seemed to indicate that a traffic circle was being proposed at that intersection. Traffic in the area is not bad enough to warrant such drastic action. At least three-quarters of the frontage of Fulton Street between Masonic and Central Avenues is reserved for bus zones; and reduction of that red zone would help to overcome traffic and parking problems in the area.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The second part of the report deals with the financial aspects of the work. It gives a detailed account of the income and expenditure for the year, and shows how the funds have been used. It also includes a statement of the assets and liabilities of the organization at the end of the year.

The third part of the report deals with the personnel of the organization. It gives a list of the staff and their duties, and also includes a statement of the salaries and other benefits paid to them. It also includes a statement of the training and development of the staff.

The fourth part of the report deals with the results of the work. It gives a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved, and also includes a statement of the impact of the work on the community.

The fifth part of the report deals with the future plans of the organization. It gives a detailed account of the projects and activities planned for the next year, and also includes a statement of the resources required for these plans.

The sixth part of the report deals with the conclusions of the work. It gives a summary of the main findings of the report, and also includes a statement of the recommendations made.

The seventh part of the report deals with the appendices. It includes a list of the various documents and reports referred to in the main text, and also includes a list of the names of the various organizations and individuals mentioned in the report.

21. The boundaries of the proposed Rehabilitation Assistance Program area should be moved north to include Haight Street.

22. The Upper Ashbury district, south of Frederick Street, is predominantly white, owner-occupied, and has a lower percentage of tenants than the lower Haight-Ashbury area which is completely different in character. It is unlikely that the problems of the lower Haight-Ashbury district could be solved through a code enforcement program, particularly in view of the numerous illegal uses in that area. If the buildings were to be brought up to code, many people would be evicted and would have to move out of San Francisco; and it is that type of people who are supposed to be benefited by rehabilitation programs. Nevertheless, it is apparent that something must be done to overcome the problems of the lower Haight-Ashbury district. In 1970 the staff of the Department of City Planning recommended a housing program for the lower Haight-Ashbury and a code enforcement program for the upper Haight-Ashbury. Now, in 1973, the staff is recommending a code enforcement program for the upper Haight-Ashbury but nothing whatsoever for the lower Haight-Ashbury. The final product of the staff's two-year study of the neighborhood is disappointing.

23. No public meetings were held to discuss the general goals for the future of the neighborhood as expressed in the staff report. Furthermore, there was not enough opportunity for sufficient community input into the plan.

24. If the Muni subway were to be extended from the west portal of the Sunset Tunnel to Ninth Avenue as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, Parnassus Avenue would have to be dug up. In the report, the staff observed that the cost of extending the subway "would be very high"; but the cost of the project would be of minimal concern compared with noise and other problems which would result. The staff also recommends that access should be improved to major destinations now underserved. What does that mean? I can get anywhere within the neighborhood within one or two minutes.

25. What plans does the City have for Polytechnic High School after its interim use as a temporary facility for Mission High School?

26. This is the first time that the City Planning Commission has met in this neighborhood. The \$250,000 allocation of revenue-sharing funds to the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood by the Board of Supervisors will be nothing more than "a drop in the bucket".

27. The food stamp store on Haight Street looks terrible. Most of the commuters passing through the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood live in the Sunset district.

28. Ownership of dwelling units by occupants should be increased; and that objective could be furthered through condominium arrangements. When people own their own dwelling units, they will have more interest in maintaining them. The old Safeway building at Stanyan and Haight Streets should be converted into a theater. We do not want Haight Street to become another Union Street; however,

JULY 26, 1973

the street should have businesses which will serve the needs of the residents of the neighborhood.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Director responded to some of the comments and questions which had been raised.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

408-1

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 2, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 2, 1973, at 1:45 P.M. in Room 232, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; George Carey, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Peter Svirskey, Planner V (Zoning); Daniel Sullivan, Planner IV (Zoning); Ronald Haney, Planner III (Zoning); Alec Bash, Planner III; William Duchek, Planner III, Urban Design; Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II; Russell Watson, Planner I; Lois Fishman, City Planning Intern; Robin Jones, City Planning Intern; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Robert Bartlett represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of June 28 and July 12, 1973 be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, informed the Commission that he had met with two members of the City Planning Committee of the 1973 Grand Jury on Wednesday afternoon.

The Director announced that a public hearing will be scheduled on October 4 to consider a proposal from the Board of Supervisors for an amendment of the City Planning Code which would permit the Commission to grant conditional uses for housing arrangements administered by non-profit agencies for rehabilitation of adults assigned or referred by the courts, with special stated limitations.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioners Mellon and Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed their seats at the Commission table.

The Director informed the Commission that the staff had contacted oil companies and the California State Automobile Association to request that the maps of San Francisco which they print for public distribution be revised so that the system of streets designated for major traffic movement will be

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

consistent with the Transportation and Urban Design elements of the Master Plan. Six of the ten major distributors of city street maps have agreed to make the revisions; and a similar positive response is anticipated from the firm which prints maps for the four remaining oil companies.

The Director continued his report by reading the following prepared statement:

"The Department has received a communication from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors containing a proposed ordinance to create a Pacific Heights Special Use District. The Commission will recall that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board kept the Pacific Heights residential use district rezoning on calendar after hearing, and that Supervisor Feinstein was to introduce the proposed special district at the full Board.

"Copies of the proposed ordinance are before you. It was drafted by the Pacific Heights Association and thus far has been reviewed only briefly by the staff. Leaving aside the serious drafting problems, what it provides, generally, is that in certain R-2 areas in Pacific Heights there be an opportunity to have R-3 density in existing or new buildings by conditional use, with certain limitations.

"The main limitation is a minimum amount of floor space for each living unit. In addition, the rear yard requirement would be stricter, being as much as 40 feet, and front setbacks would have to be equal to the setbacks of adjoining properties. Finally, the parking requirements would be modified by Section 146(h) at the end of the ordinance to relate the number of spaces required to the amount of living area and to avoid loss of amenities with renovation of existing buildings.

"The request from the Board is for the recommendations of the Commission on this ordinance. Some of the language is not clear, and the staff will have to confer with the Pacific Heights Association as to its intent. But in addition, there is no indication as to what geographical area is involved, and the proposal appears to be intended to include a reclassification of property. If the proposal is to be considered by the Commission, the Board must indicate whether the measure before the Commission is just a text amendment to create the special district, or whether a reclassification is included; if there is a reclassification, the precise area will have to be specified in the request from the Board. With your concurrence, the staff will ask for that clarification."

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be instructed to seek clarification of these matters from the Board of Supervisors before advertising the matter for public hearing.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Postmaster: Please Send Address Changes to JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

ORIGINAL ARTICLES
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States
The Problem of the Control of the Food Supply in the United States

Continuing his report, the Director read the following prepared statement:

"I have a statement I should like to make on the general subject of residential zoning.

"During the past year, especially, there has been a variety of questions raised as to the adequacy of residential zoning in San Francisco. Some of these questions have come before the Commission in the form of area reclassifications and text amendments, requiring increased time and attention on the part of the Commission and staff.

"Most of the matters raised can be put under four headings: districting on the zoning maps, the proper density limits for each area, the types of uses permitted in each district, and the other standards established by zoning such as parking requirements and the dimensions of open spaces.

"One of the most basic responsibilities of planning has always been to provide standards for new development and for retention of existing development in accordance with current needs. Zoning is still the main way to exercise such standards, and zoning has attained a special importance in San Francisco where there is so much of value to protect.

"Normally it is considered that the adequacy of zoning districts should be re-examined periodically, perhaps every ten years, and that from time to time a comprehensive revision should be made. San Francisco's present residential zoning was essentially developed 20 years ago, although its enactment dates only from 1960.

"Since the 1950's, and especially in the past five to ten years, there have been unpredicted changes in the city. There have also been important changes in public attitudes, particularly as to what constitutes urban livability and as to what might happen to the city if certain perceived trends were to continue.

"As time has passed the original assumptions of the 1960 zoning, though considered valid at that time, may well have become less tenable in the face of change. We must remember, too, that legislative amendments greatly increased the densities permitted in each district before the ordinance was enacted in 1960, causing it to depart from the Commission's Master Plan from the start. Furthermore, the 1960 ordinance did not have the benefit of a strong foundation in earlier zoning in the city, since it was really the first attempt to distinguish different types of residential areas by separate districts.

"In the past two years, revisions to the Master Plan have emphasized further the need for a broad look at residential zoning. The Residence element provides new policies for many of the matters that

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

REPORT OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF THE
BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY
FOR THE YEAR 1900

CHICAGO, ILL., 1901
PUBLISHED BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

zoning is intended to address. And the Urban Design element contains many statements on residential livability, as well as guidelines for height and bulk of buildings. With enactment of the height and bulk zoning districts, in fact, some of the use district designations may appear to be out of date.

"There are three possible approaches that can be taken in a general review of residential zoning. The first would be to rezone selected areas city-wide, using the existing district categories. This would continue the kind of work that has been done recently on neighborhood rezoning applications. The approach has been felt to be less than satisfactory, due to limitations in the districts now being used.

"The second approach would be to keep the zoning map the same, but to revise the permitted densities and some of the other standards to meet current needs. This approach would assume that all areas now falling in each district have the same characteristics, and that present boundaries occur in the proper places. These do not appear to be valid assumptions, however.

"The remaining approach, therefore, is a combination of the others, involving both the zoning map and the district standards. This would be a more straight-forward kind of revision, designed to respond to all the kinds of issues that need to be raised, and to endure for some time to come. Since 1960, all portions of the Planning Code other than those for residential districts have been extensively revised, and the new work would bring the residential provisions into phase with the rest of the code. The four categories of matters I referred to earlier -- districting, density limits, permitted uses and other standards -- all would be covered.

"The time and staff required would vary with these three approaches, although each of them might involve similar kinds of hearings and public review periods. We expect that for text changes alone the study period would be six months to one year, for mapping changes one year to 18 months, and for the combined approach 18 months to two years. Public review, hearings and legislative action would be added to these periods. With the most comprehensive approach, the total time would probably then be not less than three years.

"Staff time would also vary, with the equivalent of two people for text changes only, three for mapping only, and five for the combined approach. This time would be expected to be drawn from a number of staff members, on the basis of their skills and availability.

"It would be difficult for me to recommend anything other than the most comprehensive approach. The others would take less time and staff, but they would not address all the issues and their results would not endure.

The first of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The second of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The third of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The fourth of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The fifth of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The sixth of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

The seventh of these is the fact that the majority of the cases of this disease are reported from the United States and Canada. This is probably due to the fact that these countries have the most extensive and most accurate system of reporting diseases.

"The comprehensive approach involves work in city-wide planning, area planning, studies of building development and other kinds of background leading up to precise mapping and writing of standards. The people needed are not available now to start a full-scale effort. What I would propose is that the Department's work program for next year be arranged so as to provide for a full commitment to the residential zoning study. During the current year certain work would be accomplished as staff members became available, and I would expect that a lot of the preliminary studies could be prepared.

"Obviously, I am talking about an undertaking of major consequence, and I would not have the Department move ahead with it at any level without the concurrence of the Commission. I would like to have your endorsement of further programming of the comprehensive project on the basis that I have outlined."

Commissioner Porter suggested that the first thing the staff should do before initiating the proposed study is to determine how large San Francisco should be. She remarked that the goal on which the Zoning Ordinance of 1960 had been based was a population of 850,000 people. Since that time, the Commission had approved a number of applications for lowering density in residential neighborhoods; and, in order to determine the overall effect of the Commission's actions, she requested that a comparison be made between the zoning established in 1960 and the changes which have been made in the residential zoning patterns since that time. In her opinion, R-2 zoning makes new development unfeasible; and, if the Commission has rezoned a significant portion of the City's residential property to R-2, the population goal established in 1960 will have to be re-evaluated.

President Newman inquired about the effect which the proposed study would have on future zoning applications and on the Department of City Planning's budget for the current fiscal year. The Director replied that the proposed project would have no effect on the Department's budget for the current fiscal year because no new staff people were being contemplated. With regard to the effect of the study on future zoning applications, he read the following prepared statement:

"Any period of transition in zoning provisions is going to present problems, and city-wide changes in Residential districts may be especially challenging in this regard.

"There will be no interim controls based upon the Commission's study until there is a definite proposal for redistricting and a Commission resolution of intention.

"In the meantime, neighborhood rezoning applications may continue to be filed. The Department cannot refuse to accept the applications, but it would attempt to discourage such applications on the grounds that they would only slow down the work on the city-wide study. The same would be true, to a certain extent, for any other applications covering smaller areas.

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

"If applications are filed, the hearings on them can be delayed for a certain period, but the City Attorney has indicated that after a time a hearing must be held. Any applications of a complex nature might have to be denied after only a minimum amount of study, with one of the grounds for denial being the fact that the city-wide study is under way.

"If, after these actions by the Department and the Commission, the number of applications is still a problem, it might be necessary to seek an amendment to the Planning Code to allow acceptance of applications to be suspended for the remainder of the study period. The Planning Code change is something we would want to resort to only if it were absolutely necessary."

Commissioner Mellon asked if he were correct in assuming that the purpose of the zoning study would be to attempt to avoid the "piecemeal" approach to rezoning which the Commission has been facing recently. The Director replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the Director be authorized to proceed with further programming of the comprehensive study of residential zoning in San Francisco.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning already has an excessively heavy workload; and, in view of the staff commitments which would have to be made to the proposed residential district zoning study, and in view of the time which such a study would take, he questioned the desirability of initiating it at the present time. He suggested that the staff ought to make an effort to pull together existing plans before heading into another major study. Given the way in which the City is platted, the various neighborhoods of the City are, in fact, distinctly separate entities; and, as a result, it seemed to him that consideration of rezoning proposals must be made on a neighborhood by neighborhood or "piecemeal" basis rather than on a City-wide comprehensive basis. Before endorsing the proposed study, he would like to be given more specific information regarding the nature and length of the study; and, while the Director had indicated that no additional money would be required for the study during the course of the current fiscal year, he expected that the study would inevitably create a need for additional money at some future date.

When the question was called, the Commission voted six to one to authorize the Director to proceed with further programming of a comprehensive study of residential zoning in San Francisco. Commissioners Carey, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Newman, Porter, and Rueda voted "Aye;" Commissioner Ritchie voted "No."

ZONING HEARING

ZM73.36 334-36 CLAREMONT STREET, WEST LINE, 100 FEET SOUTH OF
ULLOA STREET.

The Committee has been instructed to examine the administration of the courts and to report on the measures which should be taken to improve it. The Committee has held many public hearings and has received many suggestions from the public. It has also held many private hearings and has received many suggestions from the judges and the lawyers. The Committee has also conducted many inquiries into the various aspects of the administration of the courts.

The Committee has found that there are many problems which are connected with the administration of the courts. These problems are of many kinds and are of many degrees of importance. Some of the most important problems are the delay in the trial of cases, the expense of litigation, and the complexity of legal procedure. The Committee has endeavored to identify these problems and to find out the causes of them.

The Committee has found that the delay in the trial of cases is one of the most serious problems. This delay is caused by many factors, including the shortage of judges, the shortage of courtrooms, and the complexity of legal procedure. The Committee has endeavored to find out the causes of this delay and to find ways of reducing it.

The Committee has found that the expense of litigation is another serious problem. This expense is caused by many factors, including the expense of hiring lawyers, the expense of going to court, and the expense of the trial itself. The Committee has endeavored to find out the causes of this expense and to find ways of reducing it.

The Committee has found that the complexity of legal procedure is another serious problem. This complexity is caused by many factors, including the complexity of the rules of procedure, the complexity of the evidence, and the complexity of the legal arguments. The Committee has endeavored to find out the causes of this complexity and to find ways of reducing it.

The Committee has found that there are many other problems which are connected with the administration of the courts. These problems are of many kinds and are of many degrees of importance. Some of the most important problems are the delay in the trial of cases, the expense of litigation, and the complexity of legal procedure. The Committee has endeavored to identify these problems and to find out the causes of them.

The Committee has found that there are many other problems which are connected with the administration of the courts. These problems are of many kinds and are of many degrees of importance. Some of the most important problems are the delay in the trial of cases, the expense of litigation, and the complexity of legal procedure. The Committee has endeavored to identify these problems and to find out the causes of them.

The Committee has found that there are many other problems which are connected with the administration of the courts. These problems are of many kinds and are of many degrees of importance. Some of the most important problems are the delay in the trial of cases, the expense of litigation, and the complexity of legal procedure. The Committee has endeavored to identify these problems and to find out the causes of them.

R-I-D TO A C-2 DISTRICT
(UNDER ADVISEMENT from meeting of July 5, 1973)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that a letter had been received from George Chopoulos, attorney for the applicant, indicating that he had written to the City Attorney regarding the feasibility of a restrictive covenant which would assure that his client's property would be used for no commercial activity other than the one which presently exists on the ground floor even if the property were to be rezoned from R-I-D to C-2 as requested in the subject applications; however, since he had not yet received a reply from the City Attorney, he requested that further consideration of this matter be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on September 6.

Mr. Steele stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had contacted the City Attorney regarding this matter; however, the matter had not been resolved to date. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the matter be continued under advisement until the meeting of September 6 as requested by the applicant.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that this matter be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on September 6, 1973.

CU73.31 400 TURK STREET, NORTHWEST CORNER OF TURK AND HYDE
STREETS.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT FOR 22
AUTOMOBILES; IN A C-3-G DISTRICT.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would abstain from participation in the discussion and voting on this matter because of a conflict of interest.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular corner lot with a frontage of 69.5 feet on Turk Street and a frontage of 68 feet on Hyde Street for a total area of approximately 4,726 square feet. It is located in a C-3-G zoning district and in a 130-E height and bulk district. The surface of the unimproved lot is covered with sand and concrete; and it has been used for parking since the service station which previously occupied the site was demolished. The applicant proposed to pave the lot and to upgrade the subject property for use as a parking lot for 22 automobiles.

G. William Tischer, representing the prospective purchaser of the subject property, remarked that the property is rather unsightly at the present time. Between ten and twelve automobiles have been using the

property for parking; and there has been a considerable amount of traffic in and out of the lot. He stated that his client intended to upgrade the property and to develop an economically viable parking lot on the site.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the plans which had been submitted indicated that the lot would handle only small and compact cars, asked if it would really be possible to exclude larger automobiles from the lot. Mr. Tischer replied in the affirmative, indicating that the size of the stalls would control this situation. In any event, any larger automobiles which might happen to be left on the lot would be towed away.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that the subject neighborhood has a deficiency of off-street parking spaces for offices, businesses, and residents. He believed that the parking lot, as proposed, would be compatible with existing and contemplated pedestrian and vehicular movement in the vicinity; and he believed that appropriate conditions controlling the development of the site could make the parking lot compatible with existing development in the vicinity. He therefore recommended that the application be approved subject to seven specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. He also suggested that it would be desirable if some bicycle parking facilities could be made available on the subject property; however, he indicated that no specific requirement of that sort was being proposed. After summarizing the conditions contained in the draft resolution, he recommended that the resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Tischer replied that the conditions were generally acceptable; however, instead of planting ten street trees, he felt that approximately one-half as many trees, supplemented with hedges, would be more effective.

Mr. Steele stated that a landscape architect on the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared a landscaping plan for the subject site; and he felt that the number of trees called for in that plan would be appropriate.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the trees which were being proposed by the staff would result in a reduction of the number of parking spaces on the property. Mr. Steele replied in the negative.

Commissioner Porter felt that there might be some value in landscaping the lot with low shrubs.

Mr. Steele felt that installation of hedges might interfere with the applicant's ability to provide the number of parking spaces proposed.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that the condition in the draft resolution should be amended to specify that the applicant would be re-

quired to plant between eight and ten street trees. Mr. Tischer stated that that modification would be acceptable.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, as revised, be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 7049 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele, as amended. Commissioner Ritchie abstained from voting on this matter.

CU73.34 935 AND 969 BUENA VISTA AVENUE (WEST) AND 60 CENTRAL AVENUE.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A BOARD AND CARE FACILITY
FOR 48 PATIENTS; IN AN R-3 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator) referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which consists of three separate lots with frontages on Buena Vista (West), Haight Street, and Central Avenue. The buildings occupying the properties are presently used as a board and care facility for 36 hospital out-patients; and the applicant had requested that the existing use be legalized for 48 hospital out-patients. Pearline Chun, the applicant, stated that she has operated a board and care facility on the subject property for the past nine years; and she indicated that she wished to obtain permission to continue to operate the facility.

Commissioner Rueda inquired about the maximum number of patients housed in individual rooms in the buildings. Mrs. Chun replied that some rooms house two people while other rooms house only one person.

Mr. Steele stated that the State licensing agency had inspected the quarters and had found that they would be adequate to house 48 individuals. Therefore, while only 36 patients were being accommodated in the facility at the present time, the applicant had requested authorization to use the facility for 48 patients.

No one else was present in the meeting room to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that there is a demonstrated need for well-managed board and care facilities in San Francisco. He remarked that continued use of the buildings as a board and care facility would not alter their exterior appearance; and he did not feel that limited continuance of the occupancy would have a serious detrimental effect on the neighborhood. However, in view of the fact that the staff of the Department of City Planning is engaged in a study concerning the distribution of board and care facilities throughout the City, he felt that approval of the application should be subject to a time limit so that the use can be re-evaluated after the staff study has been completed. He recommended

that the application be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, noting that Condition No. 6 would limit the authorization to a period of two years, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mrs. Chun replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7050 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

CU73.35 3226 - 25TH STREET, NORTH LINE, 120 FEET WEST OF
FOLSOM STREET.

REQUEST FOR A BOARD AND CARE FACILITY FOR 15 PERSONS;
IN AN R-3 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular lot with a 25-foot frontage on 25th Street and a depth of 95 feet for a total area of 2,375 square feet. The property is presently used as a board and care facility for 15 ambulatory persons; and the applicant had requested that the existing use be legalized.

Rhoda Pearson, the applicant, stated that she had operated the board and care facility for approximately 12 years on the subject property; and, prior to that time she had operated the facility at another location. She hoped that the subject application would be approved.

The Secretary called attention to a petition which had been signed by property owners and residents in the area in support of the subject application.

Wilton Herschin, 2928 Folsom Street, stated that he had signed the petition in support of the applicant's proposal; and he urged that the application be approved.

The Secretary also called attention to a letter which had been received from Zygmunt Arendt, 1015 Shotwell Street, stating that the neighborhood is already overcrowded and urging that the subject application be disapproved.

Mr. Steele stated that there is a demonstrated need for board and care facilities in San Francisco. Occupancy of the existing building for

The first of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The second of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The third of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The fourth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The fifth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The sixth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The seventh of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

The eighth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country. It has been organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in this country.

such a use would not alter the exterior appearance of the building; and he did not believe that occupancy by 15 patients would have a serious detrimental effect on the neighborhood. He therefore recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mrs. Pearson replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7051 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

ZM73.23 PROPERTY BOUNDED BY CLIPPER STREET, GRANDVIEW AVENUE,
25TH STREET AND DOUGLASS STREET, INCLUDING THE WEST
SIDE OF GRANDVIEW AVENUE BETWEEN CLIPPER AND 25TH STREETS.

R-3 TO AN R-2 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which consists of 67 lots comprising approximately 5.56 acres. He stated that the majority of the lots are developed with single family residences. Over one-quarter of the lots and approximately one half the area are still vacant. The major exception to the low-density pattern is a pair of multiple dwellings, containing a total of 46 dwelling units, on the northwest corner of Clipper and Douglass Streets. In addition, a valid building permit application is on file with the Department of City Planning for a 41-unit apartment building for Lot 16 and 20 in Assessor's Block 6543 and Lots 8 and 9 in Assessor's Block 6544; and the validity of that permit would not be affected by approval of the application for reclassification of the property.

Ben Cohen, 461 Hoffman Street and one of the applicants, stated that he had already submitted approximately 200 signatures in support of the application; and he transmitted to the Commission an additional 100 signatures which he had collected. He stated that the application had been filed because the subject neighborhood is already over-congested and unable to support further R-3 density development without serious traffic and safety problems. He pointed out the traffic which would be generated by R-3 properties on the north side of Clipper Street would flow through the R-2 district to the north; and, by rezoning the property to R-2, traffic and safety problems could be held to their present level. It appeared to him that the 1960 Zoning Ordinance had not given consideration to neighborhoods on a street-by-street basis but on a larger gross

The first part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

The second part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

The third part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

The fourth part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

The fifth part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

The sixth part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of participants. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized in a columnar fashion, with names in the first column and dates in the second column. The names are mostly male, and the dates range from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

area basis; and, as a result, actions such as the one presently proposed may be needed to correct deficiencies in that ordinance. He emphasized that the property on the south side of Clipper Street is located within the Diamond Heights Redevelopment Project area and is zoned for high density development; and he felt that Clipper Street should serve as the natural boundary between high density development on the south and lower density development on to the north. He stated that the neighborhood had learned of plans for the 41-unit apartment building which had been mentioned by Mr. Steele only because one of the residents of the neighborhood had seen a bulldozer on the site; and he felt that it was unfair to put the neighborhood on the defensive in that manner. He urged that the application for reclassification of the subject property from R-3 to R-2 be approved.

Claire Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Avenue and one of the applicants, called attention to the fact that residents of the neighborhood had been before the Commission on several occasions since 1966 to protest the nature of development being proposed in the R-3 district south of 25th Street; and she emphasized that residents of the area were overwhelmingly opposed to any further development in excess of R-1 or R-2 density standards.

Philip Hassel, 473 Hoffman Avenue, stated that he is a teacher at James Lick Jr. High School, where he had noted that most children live in houses and flats and not in apartment buildings. He indicated that one of his classes last year had studied the history of Noe Valley; and they had concluded that the area is most suitable for family living. He stated that he supported the proposal for lower density zoning because there is already too much traffic in the area, because on-street parking has become an increasing problem, and because higher density development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the neighborhood and on the strong sense of community felt by its residents.

Fred Mintner read and submitted a letter from Harry Small, president of the East and West of Castro Street Improvement Club Incorporated, as follows:

"Several years ago our organization was solidly against the construction of a Convalescent Home in the immediate vicinity of the section in question today. We feel, strongly, just as people in the Richmond feel, that our residential character ought to be preserved.

"It should be pointed out that the areas of Hoffman Ave. and Fountain St., and the 24th and 25th Streets are almost all one and two-family residences. We are for continuing this set-up. We are against the multiple residential complexes which, we feel, are truly out of place in the Noe Valley.

"The issue was fully discussed at our monthly meeting tonight. It was then moved, seconded, and carried unanimously that we are in favor of re-zoning the area in question from an R-3 down to an R-2."

The American Medical Association is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine and the health of the people. It was organized in 1847 and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in this country. Its membership is composed of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and other medical practitioners who are interested in the advancement of their profession and the welfare of the community. The Association's activities are directed towards the improvement of medical education, the advancement of medical research, and the promotion of public health. It also engages in various other activities that are designed to benefit the medical profession and the people.

The Association's primary concern is the advancement of the medical profession and the health of the people. To this end, it engages in a wide variety of activities, including the publication of journals, the holding of conferences, and the promotion of research. It also engages in various other activities that are designed to benefit the medical profession and the people. The Association's efforts are directed towards the improvement of medical education, the advancement of medical research, and the promotion of public health.

The Association's membership is composed of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and other medical practitioners who are interested in the advancement of their profession and the welfare of the community. The Association's activities are directed towards the improvement of medical education, the advancement of medical research, and the promotion of public health. It also engages in various other activities that are designed to benefit the medical profession and the people.

The Association's primary concern is the advancement of the medical profession and the health of the people. To this end, it engages in a wide variety of activities, including the publication of journals, the holding of conferences, and the promotion of research.

The Association's membership is composed of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and other medical practitioners who are interested in the advancement of their profession and the welfare of the community. The Association's activities are directed towards the improvement of medical education, the advancement of medical research, and the promotion of public health.

The Association's primary concern is the advancement of the medical profession and the health of the people. To this end, it engages in a wide variety of activities, including the publication of journals, the holding of conferences, and the promotion of research.

The Association's membership is composed of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and other medical practitioners who are interested in the advancement of their profession and the welfare of the community. The Association's activities are directed towards the improvement of medical education, the advancement of medical research, and the promotion of public health.

Mrs. John Alcester, a resident on the west side of Grand View Avenue, stated that she had lived in the area for 25 years and had already witnessed the deteriorating influence which multiple family developments have had on the area. She stated that she supported the application for rezoning from R-3 to R-2.

Laurence Grunberg, 86 Homestead Street, emphasized that streets in the area are narrow and congested; and he was fearful of the situation which would develop if more multiple unit buildings were to be constructed in the area. He stated that his own automobile had been side-swiped on two occasions.

Commissioner Fleishhacker observed that the number of automobiles in the area would increase if vacant properties were developed to R-2 density standards; and, under the circumstances, he assumed that what Mr. Grunberg was saying was that no further development whatsoever would be desirable.

Mr. Grunberg confirmed that he believed that to be a preferable alternative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked if Mr. Grunberg regarded the application to rezone properties from R-3 to R-2 as an attempt to prevent any further development in the area. Mr. Grunberg replied in the negative. However, as properties are developed in the future, he felt that special consideration would have to be given to the issue of how the additional traffic will be handled.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would be able to see a cause for real concern if the subject properties were zoned R-5 rather than R-3. He remarked that the properties had been purchased by people who had faith in the integrity of zoning and who had believed that R-3 development would be permitted; and people who had purchased property in the R-2 district to the north must have realized that properties south of 25th Street were zoned for R-3 development.

Mrs. Pilcher stated that the subject properties had been zoned R-2 when purchased by some of the present owners.

Mr. Steele stated that the subject properties were zoned Second Residential, not R-2, prior to 1960; and he emphasized that the Second Residential district was a "wide-open" zone in which all types of residential buildings were permitted.

Commissioner Ritchie commented on the fact that inactment of the 1960 Zoning Ordinance had greatly reduced the development potential of the subject properties by including them in an R-3 district which was much more restrictive than the previous Second Residential zoning.

Jane Brady, 85 Homestead Street, stated that a number of people who had signed the petition in support of the subject application live with-

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Vice-President for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Secretary for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Treasurer for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Corresponding Secretary for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Recording Secretary for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Librarian for the year 1890.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of Auditor for the year 1890.

in the area included in the subject application. Most of them have single family dwellings with back yards which about a new apartment building; and, in addition to the noise which is generated by the apartment building, and the additional traffic which it brings to the area, owners of the single-family dwellings have found beer cans thrown in their back yards. Under the circumstances, the character of the neighborhood is not the same as when they originally purchased their homes.

President Newman inquired about the number of people who had signed petitions in support of the application. Mr. Cohen replied that properties occupied by individuals who had signed in support of the application were indicated on a map which was on display on the wall of the meeting room. He stated that most of the people who signed are owners of the properties which they occupy.

Miss Brady stated that the property which had been sold most recently in the area had been sold to a black man; and she indicated that he had signed the petition in support of the reclassification. She remarked that Homestead Street has a varied racial composition because the family dwellings sell at reasonable prices. She stated that use of vacant properties in the area for a park would be desirable; however, looking at the matter realistically, it was clear that they would inevitably be developed. She stated that the new apartment building had originally been proposed as a 41-unit structure with most of the units concentrated near 25th Street; however, since the City Planning Commission had conducted a discretionary review of plans for that building at her request, the density of the building had been lowered to 30 units, more open space and landscaping had been proposed, and the developer had decided to market the dwelling units on a condominium basis. The apartment building would still be large; however, it would have less of an impact on the area than if the property had been developed to maximum R-3 standards. An apartment building which already exists at 4601 - 25th Street is considered a neighborhood eyesore; and it is clear that the one off-street parking space available for each of the dwelling units in the building is not sufficient to serve the needs of the buildings, tenants and their guests. In conclusion, she advised the Commission that it has long been held that decrease of zoning density for the purpose of conforming with the character of development in the surrounding neighborhood is proper as long as the reasons for the zoning change are valid.

Commissioner Porter remarked that housing is scarce in all neighborhoods of San Francisco. The present R-3 zoning of the property would accommodate more families. R-2 zoning would not necessarily mean that no apartments could be constructed in the area; however, it would considerably reduce the number of apartment units which would be permitted. Based on the experiences of other developers in the area, she seriously questioned whether development under R-2 standards would be economically feasible.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the preferences of owners of properties which would actually be affected by the proposed reclassification.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The second part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The third part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The fourth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The fifth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The sixth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The seventh part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The eighth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The ninth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The tenth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

tion. Mr. Cohen stated that the owners of 30 of the lots to be rezoned were in favor of the proposal. The owners of four parcels of property included in the application were more than likely opposed to the proposal.

Commissioner Ritchie observed that the properties owned by individuals who had not signed petitions in support of the application constituted the bulk of the property under consideration.

Mrs. Smith, 4530 - 25th Street, stated that she had resided in the area for 21 years and had watched the neighborhood change. She stated that she had circulated a petition in support of the application on her block; and the petition had been signed by everyone in the block with the exception of one person who was away. In addition, two owners of R-3 properties on the south side of 25th Street had signed the petition in support of the proposed reclassification. She stated that she was also worried about the fact that a large house occupying approximately 3 lots exists on the south side of 25th Street and is owned by an elderly man; and she feared that those properties would be developed with an apartment building in the near future if R-3 zoning is retained. If so, she expected that her living condition would become intolerable and that her property would be lessened in value.

Mr. Cohen submitted a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Alperstein, owners of property on 25th Street, urging that the subject application be approved in order to slow the growth of parking and traffic problems in the area.

Mrs. Lym, 4751 - 25th Street, stated that she, her husband and three sons reside on property which had been included in the subject application. She remarked that apartments in the area are filled with single people with automobiles; and, since she would prefer that the neighborhood have more families rather than single people, she urged that the requested reclassification from R-3 to R-2 be approved.

Allan Brotsky, part-owner of one of the undeveloped properties included in the subject application, stated that he was opposed to the proposed reclassification. He stated that their property had been acquired in 1960; and, although all of their proposals had been consistent with family occupancy, the property had been a disaster financially over the years. Approval of the proposed reclassification would turn the situation into an utter catastrophe. He remarked that people living in a particular neighborhood are inclined to have their own particular selfish interests; and he emphasized that it is the responsibility of the Commission to look to the broader issue of the general public interest. When matters of zoning reclassifications are under consideration, the law provides that the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors may approve such applications only if the changes are required by public necessity, convenience, or general welfare. He stated that he lives on Divisadero Street, a street which has absorbed much of the traffic from Roosevelt Way; and, while he would prefer that the addi-

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of life, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all found in the same place, and at the same time. The author also discusses the theory of evolution, and shows that it is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all found in the same place, and at the same time.

The second part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the problem of the origin of the human race. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of the human race, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all found in the same place, and at the same time.

The third part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the problem of the origin of the human mind. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of the human mind, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all found in the same place, and at the same time.

The fourth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the problem of the origin of the human soul. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of the human soul, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all found in the same place, and at the same time.

tional traffic did not exist, he realized that living in a city requires that the interests of various neighborhoods be balanced against each other. Individuals who had spoken in support of the subject application had stated that one of the purposes of the rezoning would be to prevent generation of additional traffic which would pass through the neighborhood north of 25th Street; but he believed that development of his property to R-3 standards would have no effect on traffic through that area. As more applications come before the Commission for reclassification of properties to R-2, a decision will have to be made as to whether it is feasible or desirable for San Francisco to become a city of single family or R-2 homes; and he felt that the best way to make a decision on that issue would be through the City-wide comprehensive residential zoning study which had been proposed by the Director of Planning earlier in the meeting. He emphasized that there are a great variety of people in the City; and he remarked that many of them want to live in family-oriented apartment buildings. He stated that he could see no relationship between the proposed reclassification and the public convenience or general welfare; and, with regard to the traffic situation, he pointed out that any traffic removed from one street will inevitably be directed to some other street. The application had stated that the subject properties do not have access onto Clipper Street; however, access to Clipper Street is in fact available from his property and from property owned by Mrs. Goodrich. As a result, he believed that traffic from any development constructed on those properties would move up Clipper Street to Portola Drive and then to downtown San Francisco by way of Market Street. Given that fact, and in view of the fact that north-south streets have been closed south of 25th Street, his property is virtually isolated from the neighborhood below 25th Street. He stated that the zoning of his property when it was purchased in 1960 would have allowed construction of 60 dwelling units; however, he and his partner had planned to construct only 44 family units on the site. Because of the tight-money market which developed, they were unable to proceed with their project. He stated that multi-unit buildings already exist on some of the properties included in the application and on properties on the north side of 25th Street; and he emphasized that the owners of the greater portion of property included in the application were opposed to the reclassification. He noted that the neighborhood had been successful in achieving modifications in the apartment building most recently proposed by requesting the Commission to conduct a discretionary review of the developer's plans; and he believed that the concerns of the neighborhood about future development of his property could be handled in the same way.

Gerald Hill, attorney for the Lopez family, owners of one of the vacant parcels of property included in the subject application, felt that it was clear that sponsors of the subject application hoped that reclassification of the properties to R-2 would prevent or delay development. In his opinion, the reclassification would not have that effect; however, the development which would occur if the properties were to be rezoned would be of a type much worse than R-3 buildings which had been constructed in the area. He pointed out that there is a steep bluff south of 25th Street; and, as a result, his client's property bears no relationship whatsoever to properties located north of 25th Street. When their property is developed, tenants will generally drive up Clipper Street to Portola Drive, traveling into

downtown San Francisco on Market; and only rarely would traffic from the property be directed down 25th Street. He also emphasized that property south of Clipper Street is zoned R-4. If the subject property were reclassified to R-2, development of his client's property would probably be delayed. He assumed that his client would not wish to develop the property under such circumstances; however, eventually someone would purchase the property for construction of a "schlock" building. He stated that he was impressed by the fact that Mr. Hayman, a developer who already has a valid building permit application on file, is working with residents of the neighborhood to refine plans for his project; and he indicated that his clients would favor a similar discretionary review process rather than the blanket rezoning presently under consideration. In order to be developed economically, land in this area must be permitted a density slightly higher than that allowable under R-2 zoning standards. He stated that he had no argument with the neighborhood's stated objective of preserving the character of the area; however, he believed that R-2 zoning would not be appropriate for the subject properties and that it would result in uncontrolled development with fewer amenities. The preferable way of proceeding would be to retain the R-3 zoning of the properties and to conduct discretionary reviews of any specific projects proposed. He urged that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Hill if he were suggesting that the Commission should adopt a policy of conducting discretionary reviews of all new projects proposed for R-3 properties in the area. Mr. Hill replied that he felt that residents of the neighborhood would want the Commission to conduct discretionary reviews of each individual project; and he believed that his clients would not be opposed to such a procedure.

Mrs. Goodrich, owner of one of the vacant parcels of property included in the subject application, advised the Commission that she had no intention of developing her property during her lifetime; however, she felt that the entire area under consideration is admirably suited for development at a higher density than that of the neighborhood to the north. If high buildings were constructed on the subject properties, they would have spectacular views; and they would not interfere with views presently enjoyed from other homes.

President Newman pointed out that the subject properties are governed by a 40-foot height limit. Mrs. Goodrich acknowledged that fact but remarked that higher buildings could theoretically be constructed on the property without hurting anyone.

Jim Thoresen, representing the Atlas Realty Company, stated that approval of the subject application would split the zoning of their property into two parts. He stated that development of their property had been hampered by the fact that the property has not had access; however, in view of the recent action taken by the City to establish an assessment district for the improvement of High Street, they were encouraged about the future prospects for development of the property. In 1970, a rendering was prepared of a Mediterranean-type of apartment building which might be constructed on the property; and he displayed and described that rendering. If the

portion of the subject property included in the subject application were to be rezoned to R-2, however, the building could not be constructed. Therefore, if the Commission wished to take favorable action on the application, he requested that the property owned by his firm be excluded and that it be allowed to remain R-3.

Sam Pichey, Mr. Brotsky's partner, stated that if their property were "down-zoned" to R-2, it would not be economically possible for them to provide middle income housing. More expensive housing would have to be constructed, which most people would not be able to afford; and those who could afford the housing would probably prefer not to live in the subject neighborhood. Construction of apartments for single people would not be a feasible alternative. The only proper way to develop the property would be with two-and three-bedroom apartments suitable for families which could be sold on a condominium basis; and, in view of the fact that no new single-family homes are being sold in San Francisco for less than \$50,000, he felt that the type of project which he proposed to construct would be of value to the City.

Mr. Hayman, owner of a vacant parcel of the subject property for which a valid building permit application is on file, stated that he was opposed the proposed reclassification in spite of the fact that his project was already well under way. He stated that he had wished to construct 40 dwelling units. Residents of the neighborhood, on the other hand, had requested that the number of units be limited to 20. They had finally compromised on plans for a 30-unit building. He noted that "down-zoning" had already taken place in Pacific Heights and in the Richmond district; but he felt that that was the wrong way to deal with the problems in the residential neighborhoods. If the practice continues, older people who have fixed incomes will eventually be excluded from living in the City. In R-1 and R-2 areas, families often have more automobiles than they can accommodate in their garages; and, as a result, they are parked on the street. In R-3 districts, however, one off-street parking space is provided for each dwelling unit; and residents of the apartments rarely have more than one automobile. Under the present circumstances, the only way for developers to come out ahead with multiple-unit buildings is to sell them on a condominium basis.

A resident of the area who lives three doors north of 25th Street stated that he was opposed to the subject application.

Mimi Mueller stated that she is a resident of Bernal Heights and that she was present because of another matter on the Commission's agenda. However, she felt that action should be taken by the Commission in neighborhoods other than her own to preserve existing family neighborhoods.

Mr. Steele noted that there is a significant difference in topography between the northern and southern portions of the subject property; and he pointed out that most of the northernmost properties are already developed with single-family dwellings. Under the circumstances, he felt that it would be appropriate to approve the application in part and to disapprove it in part, leaving the southernmost portions of the subject properties zoned R-3 and reclassifying the northern portion of the

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1911-1912.

properties to R-2. He then proceeded to explain how his proposal would affect the development potential of the major parcels of vacant property under consideration. If all of the property owned by the Lopez family were to remain zoned R-3, 38 dwelling units could legally be constructed on the site. If the entire parcel were rezoned to R-2, only 20 dwelling units could be constructed. However, under his proposal to rezone the northern portion of the property to R-2, a total of 32 dwelling units would be permitted on the site. If the land owned by Mr. Brotsky and Mr. Pichey were to retain its R-3 zoning, a total of 27 dwelling units would be permitted. If the entire property were to be reclassified to R-2, only 14 dwelling units would be permitted. If the rezoning which he had recommended were to be approved, a total of 17 dwelling units could be constructed on the site. The property owned by Mr. Hayman would not be affected by the proposed reclassification. However, by way of example, he indicated that 40 dwelling units would be permitted if the entire parcel of property were zoned R-3, 21 dwelling units would be permitted if the entire property were zoned R-2, and 29 dwelling units would be permitted if the zoning of the property were split as he had recommended. With regard to the properties of the west side of Grand View Avenue which were included in the subject application, he recommended that all parcels except for the property owned by the Atlas Realty Company be reclassified to R-2.

Commissioner Porter asked if the project which Mr. Hayman proposed to construct would become non-conforming if action were to be taken on the proposed reclassification as recommended by Mr. Steele. Mr. Steele replied that the project would be non-conforming to the extent of one unit since Mr. Hayman proposed to construct only 30 dwelling units where 29 dwelling units would be permitted on the property under the zoning which he had proposed.

Commissioner Porter acknowledged that the reclassification which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would restrict the density which would be permitted on the subject properties, thus accomplishing one of the objectives of the residents of the neighborhood. However, she felt that it was important that the Commission should have absolute control over the type of developments proposed in the area in the future; and she wondered if the Commission would not be in a better position to retain the present R-3 zoning and to undertake a discretionary review of any new projects proposed.

Mr. Steele observed that the Commission would have the authority to conduct discretionary reviews of specific projects in any case.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was appalled by the solution which had been recommended by the staff. In his opinion, there should either be a strong compromise or no compromise at all; and he did not feel that the "wishy-washy" compromise proposed by the staff would be good for either side. The action recommended by the staff would not accomplish the objectives sought by the neighborhood; and, by splitting vacant parcels of property into two zoning districts, odd-shaped building sites would result which would be difficult to develop.

The first of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a voluntary association of physicians and surgeons, and is not a government agency. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The second of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The third of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The fourth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The fifth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The sixth of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

The seventh of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession. It is a body of men who are interested in the health of the community, and who are willing to work for the betterment of the medical profession.

AUGUST 2, 1973

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not feel that the results of the staff recommendation, except in the case of the property owned by Mr. Brotsky and Mr. Pichey, would not be as disturbing as Commissioner Ritchie anticipated. The number of dwelling units permitted on the property owned by the Lopez family would be reduced from 38 to 32; however, he emphasized that the attorney for the family has stated that they had no intention of developing the property to the maximum permitted density. The zoning recommended for the property owned by Mr. Hayman would permit construction of 29 dwelling units, which is only one unit less than Mr. Hayman intends to construct. No figures had been given with regard to the effect of the proposed rezoning of the property owned by Mrs. Goodrich. However, the proposed zoning would reduce the number of permitted dwelling units on the property owned by Mr. Brotsky and Mr. Pichey from 27 to 17; and he regarded that reduction as a little too severe.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was primarily concerned about the shape of the building sites which would result if the new zoning lines were to be drawn as recommended by Mr. Steele.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the density permitted on a lot could be concentrated in one location rather than being distributed equally on the property. Mr. Steele replied that development in R-2 districts cannot exceed R-2 density standards; however, the density permitted on the R-2 portions of the property could be constructed on the R-3 portion of the properties.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that he did not regard the staff recommendation as a "compromise" but as a reflection of the best land use for the area. Given the existing character of development on 25th Street, he felt that properties fronting on that street should be zoned R-2. However, the southern portions of the subject properties, some of which have access onto Clipper or to side streets, would be suitable for R-3 development if the development is carefully designed.

Commissioner Rueda stated that his preference would be to leave the present R-3 zoning of the properties unchanged and to conduct discretionary reviews of any specific developments proposed in the future.

President Newman stated that he regarded the recommendation of the Director to be almost "Solomon-like" in character. R-2 zoning along 25th Street would meet the needs of the neighborhood; and the traffic which would be generated by the higher density development permitted on the southern portions of the property could be channeled onto Clipper Street. Furthermore, the Commission would still have the right to undertake a discretionary review of any particular project proposed.

Mr. Brotsky stated that President Newman was ignoring the fact that the effect of the staff recommendation would be to "chop the baby in two." He stated that he was thoroughly familiar with the economics of property development; and he advised the Commission that the zoning which had been recommended by the staff would make it impossible to develop either the upper or the lower portions of the vacant properties. He indicated that R-3 buildings already exist on both the north and the south sides of 25th Street in the vicinity of his property; and he felt that the observations which had been made by Commissioner Ritchie regarding the staff recommendation were absolutely correct.

Commissioner Mellon inquired about the total difference in the number of dwelling units which would be permitted if the property were to remain zoned R-3 as opposed to the split-zoning which was being recommended by the staff. The Director replied that a total of 105 dwelling units would be permitted on the vacant properties if they were to retain their R-3 zoning whereas the maximum number of units which would be permitted if the property were to be reclassified as recommended by the staff would be 78.

Commissioner Mellon observed that it would probably not be economically feasible to develop the properties with moderate income housing if the permitted number of dwelling units were to be reduced by that extent.

The Director remarked that Mr. Hayman had apparently found that construction at a reduced density would be economically feasible.

Commissioner Mellon pointed out that the proposed reclassification would reduce the number of units permitted on the property owned by Mr. Brotsky from 27 to 17; and Mr. Brotsky had stated that it would not be possible to develop his property with middle-income housing under those circumstances.

The Director commented on the fact that Mr. Brotsky had previously stated that any concern of the Commission should be City-wide in scope; and he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning felt that the zoning pattern which they had recommended would result in the best development for the City.

Gloria Diana Ramos, owner of property at 151 Ripley Street which was included in another application to be heard by the Commission later in the afternoon, stated that she had experienced great difficulty in developing her property because one portion of it is zoned R-2 (sic) while the other portion is zoned R-3.

Mr. Hill stated that reduction of the permitted number of dwelling units on the property owned by his clients from 38 to 32 would not be so bad; however, it seemed to him that the staff recommendation would require the dwelling units to be concentrated near the backyards of existing buildings rather than higher on the hill.

The Director stated that the opposite was true. In fact, all of the permitted dwelling units could be concentrated on the R-3 portion of the property located higher on the hill.

Commissioner Rueda asked if it would be possible for the owners of the subject properties to concentrate all of the dwelling units on the R-3 portion of their properties, leaving the R-2 portions entirely vacant. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he did not feel that R-2 zoning would be workable; and, therefore, he moved that the recommendation of the Director be rejected. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mellon.

Commissioner Porter stated that she found it difficult to visualize what the effects of the staff recommendation would be; and, under the circumstances, she suggested that it might be wise to take the matter under advisement to permit members of the Commission and residents of the neighborhood to study the staff recommendation in greater detail.

Commissioner Mellon stated that the owners of the vacant parcels of property included in the subject application had stated that they were interested in constructing moderate-income family apartments; and, since that type of construction is difficult to achieve, he felt that the Commission should not take any action which would discourage the prospects for such development.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5 to 1 on the motion to reject the recommendation of the Director. Commissioners Carey, Mellon, Porter, Ritchie, and Rueda voted "Aye;" Commissioner Newman voted "No." Commissioner Fleishhacker abstained from voting.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda and seconded by Commissioner Mellon that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Rueda stated the City needs moderate income housing; and he emphasized that the owners of the vacant parcels of property included in the application had stated that it was their intention to provide that type of housing. If any other type of housing should be proposed, he felt that the proposal should be subject to discretionary review by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter felt that all new development proposed should be subject to discretionary reviews so that the Commission could review such factors as parking, access, and egress.

Commissioners Rueda and Mellon indicated that they would be willing to amend their motion and second to provide that it would be the intention of the Commission to conduct a discretionary review of any building permit application filed for development of vacant parcels of property included in the subject application.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under
Post Office No. 312, Special Delivery.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917,
authorized on July 16, 1918. Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.
Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association
Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and all correspondence relating to this journal
should be sent to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Ill.

Advertisements should be sent to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Ill.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under
Post Office No. 312, Special Delivery.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917,
authorized on July 16, 1918. Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association
Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and all correspondence relating to this journal
should be sent to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Ill.

President Newman stated that he intended to vote against the motion because it reflected a total disregard for the wishes of residents of the neighborhood.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 6 to 1 to adopt Resolution No. 7052, disapproving the subject application and specifying that all building permit applications for development of the vacant parcels of property included in the application would be subject to discretionary review by the Commission.

Commissioners Carey, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter, Ritchie, and Rueda voted "Aye;" Commissioner Newman voted "No."

At 4:45 P.M. President Newman announced a five-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:50 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

EE73.79 CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
PROPOSED OFFICE BUILDING WITH 300 OFF-STREET
PARKING SPACES TO BE LOCATED IN THE BLOCK BOUNDED
BY FRONT, GREEN, DAVIS, AND VALLEJO STREETS.

The Environmental Impact Report was summarized by Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning). After hearing from members of the audience including Stewart Bloom, representing the San Francisco Loyal Opposition; Betty Rader, Chairman of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers Environmental Committee; Gerson Bakar, the developer; and Mr. Bakar's associates, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7053 be adopted with the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does hereby find that the final Environmental Impact Report, dated August 2, 1973, concerning 'proposed Master Charge building, vicinity of Front, Green, Davis and Vallejo Streets,' is adequate, accurate and objective and does hereby CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said report; AND be it further resolved, that the Commission, in certifying the completion of said report, does hereby find that the project as proposed will not have a significant effect on the environment; AND be it further resolved that the Commission takes said final environmental impact report into consideration before acting on the project itself under CU73.32 and does hereby signify such consideration by ADOPTING said report."

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the offices of the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription.

CU73.32 BLOCK BOUNDED GENERALLY BY FRONT, GREEN, DAVIS AND VALLEJO STREETS. REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR AN OFFICE BUILDING WITH 300 OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES WHEN THE CITY PLANNING CODE REQUIRES APPROXIMATELY 270 PARKING SPACES; IN A C-2 AND 40X DISTRICT, AND IN NORTHERN WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 3.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has an area of approximately 75,400 square feet. The property is presently occupied by a one- and two-story warehouse and office building surrounded by a large asphalt and cobblestone paved public parking lot. The property is owned by the San Francisco Port Commission which would lease the site to the applicant for a period of approximately 66 years. The applicant proposed to construct an office building with a height of 40 feet on the property which he would sublease to the Western States Bank Card Association, WSBA (Master Charge). The subject application had been filed because the applicant proposed to provide 30 more off-street parking spaces than required by the City Planning Code; and Section 240.3(f) of the Code requires conditional use approval for buildings in the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 3 which provide more off-street parking than would ordinarily be required.

Donald Wyler, representing the applicant, stated that 15 sites in San Francisco had been considered for the proposed building; however, the subject property offered attractions including easy access to public transportation, security, and sufficient size to enable a building with large floor areas to be constructed. He stated that the applicant had met with citizen groups to explain the project and to receive their comments on the proposal; and the design of the building had evolved from those discussions.

Gio Obata, architect for the applicant, displayed and described renderings and a model of the proposed building. He indicated that the two lower floors of the building would be used for parking; and the two upper floors of the building would be used for office space.

President Newman asked if the automobiles would be visible to pedestrians at street level. Mr. Obata replied in the negative, indicating that the parked automobiles would be screened by a brick wall and by landscaping. He also remarked that the proposed building would have three internal courtyards with planting and that the required setback for the proposed Embarcadero Parkway would be landscaped.

Subscription prices: Five dollars per annum in advance. Single copies, fifteen cents. Payment in advance. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at special rate of \$4.00 per annum authorized by Act of Congress, October 3, 1917. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917 authorized on July 1, 1918.

Postmaster: This journal is published weekly except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sent by mail first-class, postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Copyright, 1918, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this journal in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

Published by The American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Editor: J. C. Thompson, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Business Manager: J. C. Thompson, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Associate Editor: J. C. Thompson, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription Department: 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Advertising Department: 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Printed by The American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Gerson Bakar, the applicant, pointed out that the two lower floors of the proposed building would be recessed; and, as a result, the two upper floors would appear to "float" approximately 13 feet above the ground. He indicated that the brick to be used in the wall which would screen the parking garage would be similar to the brick on building walls across the street from the project. He also advised the Commission that the building would be occupied on a 24-hour a day basis and would have a substantial night-time population.

Commissioner Fleishhacker inquired about the height of the brick wall which would screen the parking garage. Mr. Bakar replied that the wall would have a height of $7\frac{1}{2}$ or 8 feet.

Stewart Bloom, representing the San Francisco Loyal Opposition, noted that the Environmental Protection Agency's plan for a 20 percent reduction of public parking spaces in San Francisco will go into effect in August, pending the results of a hearing to be held by that agency later in the month. He emphasized that the subject property is located near to major mass transit routes; and, in view of the fact that the environmental impact report for the proposed project had indicated that the 30 additional parking spaces being requested would be rented to the public, he felt that approval of the application would be in obvious conflict with the objectives of the Environmental Protection Agency. Furthermore, if San Francisco is ever going to take steps to encourage use of public transportation rather than private automobiles, the present is as good a time to start as any; and he felt that employees who would be working in the proposed building might as well get into the habit of using public transportation from the beginning. He did not believe that the proposed project would be in the best interests of the City's environment; and he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Bloom if he felt that the proposed office building should be constructed without any parking spaces whatsoever. Mr. Bloom replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Wyler noted that most of the subject property is presently used as a parking lot; and he indicated that the proposed development would result in a net reduction of 50 parking spaces on the site.

Charles Starbuck, representing the San Francisco Ecology Center, observed that we are on the eve of a transportation revolution; and he urged the Commission to make an effort in good faith to reduce the parking requirements of the City Planning Code by 20 percent in keeping with the Environmental Protection Agency's recommendation. He acknowledged that the recommendations of the Environmental Protection Agency pertained to public off-street parking. However, he felt that the rationale which that agency had used could be applied to private off-street parking as well. He did not feel that a 20 percent reduction of the amount of parking space proposed for the project under consideration would impose a hardship on future use of the building. He stated that the U. S. government had become involved in environmental protection by default; and he believed that San Francisco should take the lead in correcting the situation. In conclusion, he emphasized that action by the Commission approving the conditional use application would result in the creation of an irreversible parking facility for 300 automobiles.

Commissioner Mellon advised Mr. Starbuck that the Bay Area Pollution Control District has reported that air quality in San Francisco has actually improved since 1969.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that the floor-to-ceiling height in the proposed parking garage would be such that the space could be converted for other use in the future; and, as a result, approval of the application would not result in the creation of an irreversible parking facility. He stated that he was a little bit skeptical about the methods that had been used by the Environmental Protection Agency in formulating their recommendations; and he suspected that some of their findings could lead to the creation of a counter-movement. He recommended that the application be approved subject to 13 specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by the Director would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Bakar replied in the affirmative.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Ritchie that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman felt that the proposed facility would be one of which San Francisco could be proud. The Master Charge operation is one of high intensity employment and provides jobs for minority people; and he felt that it was to the credit of the firm that it had decided to stay in San Francisco.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that people tend to forget that it is becoming increasingly more difficult to keep industries such as the Master Charge operation in San Francisco. He felt that the developer and his architect had produced a very exceptional building design which would bring to San Francisco an additional, one-tenant building equal to, or better than, many suburban office buildings. He was especially pleased by the third floor setback which would give the building the appearance of a two-story building from street level; and he believed that the building would prove to be a most attractive adaptation within the 40-foot height limit. The courtyards and exterior landscaping, as well as the mini-park-like character of the landscaped corner on the Embarcadero, would give an additional pleasant effect to the building. As a single-tenant building, he felt that it would become somewhat of a landmark in San Francisco; and he believed that the applicant and his architect should be complimented on the results of their efforts.

Commissioner Fleishhacker emphasized that the Environmental Protection Agency program, if ever put into effect, will relate only to the reduction of public parking; and, since the parking which would be provided within the building presently under consideration would be private, it would not be affected by the Environmental Protection Agency's program.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 7054 and to approve the application subject to the conditions which have been recommended by the Director.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

ZM73.24 BOTH SIDES OF RIPLEY STREET BETWEEN HARRISON AND
FOLSOM STREETS. R-3 TO AN R-2 DISTRICT.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which consists of 31 lots having a total of 76,075 square feet. The lots are presently developed with 16 single-family dwellings, 3 two-family dwellings, one four-unit apartment building, and one five-unit apartment building. Eleven of the lots are vacant.

Jane Wrench, the applicant and owner of the property at 101 Ripley Street, stated that her reasons for requesting the rezoning of the subject properties from R-3 to R-2 were as follows:

- "1. Desire to retain the physical character and charm of the area, rather than encourage over-development.
- "2. Area is best suited to family housing; parks, schools, and swimming pool nearby.

- "3. Area is not well-located for high densities; major shopping and main transit facilities are not nearby.
- "4. Street is too narrow for intensive land use. Parking on both sides makes it difficult for approaching vehicles to pass.
- "5. Topography is severe problem. Uphill lots (majority of underdeveloped land) may not be physically able to provide parking even for two-family development. Extremely costly and potentially hazardous earth removal and retaining walls would be necessitated by apartment development.
- "6. Eleven years with R-3 zoning - but just one R-3 building constructed - indicates the inappropriateness of the zoning - however, two two-unit buildings have been built in this area."

Mrs. Wrench stated that she had circulated petitions which had been signed by 85 property owners and 40 renters within a 300-foot radius of the subject property in support of the subject application. In addition, 20 people from outside the 300-foot radius area had indicated their support for the proposed reclassification.

Commissioner Rueda, noting that Mrs. Wrench had stated that the area is best suited for family housing, suggested that families might live in apartment buildings in the area if they were to be constructed. Mrs. Wrench conceded that that might be the case.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Mrs. Wrench had stated that three buildings had been constructed in the area during the past eleven years, asked when the buildings were constructed. Mrs. Wrench replied that the R-3 building was constructed in 1966 or 1967. The R-2 buildings were constructed in 1963 and 1965.

Commissioner Fleishhacker observed that no building had been constructed in the area for seven years.

Mimi Mueller, past-President of the Bernal Heights Association and presently a member of the Board of Directors of that organization, read the following letter which had been addressed to Mr. Steele by Jerry Schimmel, President of the Bernal Heights Association:

"Our Association has been approached by the Ripley Street neighbors about the zoning problem there. Many of these residents are Association members. They have highlighted what we believe to be a city-wide problem - that of overzoning in residential neighborhoods. As we understand it, the block of Ripley Street under hearing is now an R-3 area. Based on our own discussions, we think that

this overzoning practice is to the detriment of our neighborhood and many others. It tends to encourage property speculation and over-development, which for a residential area can be disastrous, especially if multi-unit buildings are erected.

"We therefore take the position that the Ripley Street neighbors are well within their rights in requesting that their part of the neighborhood be downzoned from R-3 to R-2. This downzoning leaves room for development and potential return to the existing owners of underdeveloped property, and does not leave the door open for destructive over-development. We would be happy to present further testimony on this matter."

Mrs. Mueller observed that developers coming before the City Planning Commission usually hire lawyers and deduct their fees from their income tax; however, property owners interested in preserving the middle-income family character of their neighborhoods have to take off from work to come to the Commission's meetings to defend what they already have.

Dave Rabb, former owner of property located at 119 Ripley Street which contains a five-unit apartment building, stated that the present owner of the property also owns an adjacent vacant lot which could be developed with three dwelling units under the present R-3 zoning; however, because of the tight money market, he had not been able to proceed with that project. If the vacant parcel of property were reclassified to R-2, the present owner of the property could build only two units; and, as a result, he would lose \$4,000 on his investment.

Betty Guy, owner of one of the subject parcels of property, stated that she had signed a petition in support of the application; however, since it appeared that reclassification of the properties to R-2 would make it impossible for the owners of adjacent vacant lots to develop their property, she requested that her name be removed from the petition. While she would really prefer that the properties be reclassified to R-1, she realized that such a reclassification would not be practical under present circumstances.

Harvey Black representing John Nichols, owner of lots on the south side of Ripley Street, stated that his client had intended to construct family apartments on his property. Although the lots would be difficult to develop, a total of 22 dwelling units would be possible under R-3 zoning while only 16 dwelling units would be possible under R-2 zoning. He acknowledged that the subject neighborhood is a family area; however, it did not seem to him that that point was at issue. He noted that Mr. Brotsky, speaking on a case heard by the Commission earlier in the afternoon, had emphasized that changes of zoning must be justified in terms of the general welfare; and he remarked that reclassification of the subject properties to R-2 would make any development economically infeasible. Furthermore, if the City Planning Commission has a policy of encouraging development of family housing, approval of the proposed reclassification would defeat that policy.

George Ayoub, owner of lots 33 and 33B in block 5524, stated that he had intended to construct six dwelling units on his property; however, he had not been able to proceed with that development because he had not been able to obtain financing.

Gloria Diana Ramos, owner of property located at 151 Ripley Street, indicated that she had submitted a two-page statement to individual members of the Commission; and, rather than taking the time to read that statement aloud, she urged that it be read by the Commissioners. She stated that the portion of her property fronting on Ripley Street is zoned R-3; however, an adjacent parcel of property to the rear which fronts on Harrison Street is zoned R-2. She had previously been advised in a letter from Mr. Steele that she could not concentrate the total permitted density upon the R-3 portion of the property. However, during the Commission's hearing of application ZM73.23 earlier in the afternoon, the statements which had been made by Mr. Steele had appeared to contradict the information contained in the earlier letter. If that were the case, the development which she wished to construct had been unnecessarily postponed by six months.

Elizabeth Dagan stated that she was in favor of the proposed reclassification. She pointed out that properties on one side of Alabama Street are zoned R-1 and that properties on the other side of the street are zoned R-2; and she emphasized that the street has a curb-to-curb width of 52 feet. Folsom Street also has a curb-to-curb width of 52 feet; and properties on both sides of that street are zoned R-2. Ripley Street, on the other hand, has a curb-to-curb width of only 30 feet; and, under the circumstances, she felt that construction of R-3 buildings on the street would be most undesirable.

A member of the audience submitted a photograph which he had taken of the subject portion of Ripley Street.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that 30 single-family dwellings were recently constructed on more difficult property on Bradford Street. The houses had been priced between \$30,000 and \$40,000; and they had sold quickly. Thus, he felt that it was clear that there is a market for family housing in the subject neighborhood. He stated that the residential element of the Master Plan calls for low density development of the subject properties; and he pointed out that existing development in the area is predominantly one- and two-family buildings. Reclassification of the properties to R-2 would reflect the existing density, scale, and character of the area and would encourage compatible new construction on lots which are presently vacant. He remarked that Ripley Street is a narrow street which can be easily impacted by more intense development as permitted by the present R-3 zoning; and, therefore, reclassification of the property to R-2 would be in the public interest. He recommended that the application be approved.

The American Medical Association is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine and the health of the people. It was organized in 1847 and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in this country. Its objects are to advance the science and art of medicine, to promote the health of the people, and to protect the public interest in the medical profession. It does this by publishing a journal, holding annual meetings, and by other means. It is a body of men who are interested in the progress of medicine and the health of the people, and who are willing to devote their time and energy to these ends. It is a body of men who are interested in the progress of medicine and the health of the people, and who are willing to devote their time and energy to these ends.

The American Medical Association is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine and the health of the people. It was organized in 1847 and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in this country. Its objects are to advance the science and art of medicine, to promote the health of the people, and to protect the public interest in the medical profession. It does this by publishing a journal, holding annual meetings, and by other means. It is a body of men who are interested in the progress of medicine and the health of the people, and who are willing to devote their time and energy to these ends.

The American Medical Association is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine and the health of the people. It was organized in 1847 and has since that time been the leading organization of the medical profession in this country. Its objects are to advance the science and art of medicine, to promote the health of the people, and to protect the public interest in the medical profession. It does this by publishing a journal, holding annual meetings, and by other means. It is a body of men who are interested in the progress of medicine and the health of the people, and who are willing to devote their time and energy to these ends.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the subject R-3 district is surrounded by R-1 and R-2 districts, asked why the properties had been zoned R-3 in the first place. The Director replied that he had been advised that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the properties be zoned R-2; and he indicated that he did not know why the properties had been zoned R-3.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the application be approved.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he intended to vote against the motion. He remarked that the Commission had just disapproved a similar application for reclassification of properties on 25th Street from R-3 to R-2; and he felt that the reasons given in support of that action would apply to the present case, also. He felt that development of the subject properties under R-2 standards would be economically infeasible; and he was of the opinion that better development would occur under the existing R-3 zoning.

When the question was called, the Commission voted five to one to adopt Resolution No. 7055 and to approve the subject application. Commissioners Carey, Fleishhacker, Newman, Porter, and Ritchie voted "Aye;" Commissioner Rueda voted "No."

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

Published weekly, except on Sundays, and on the last day of the month. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 10 cents. The journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 26, 1901, under post office number 374, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement of post office and postmaster. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postpaid.

Copyright, 1918, by American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Volume 17, No. 1, January 1, 1918

ABJ
File
↑

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 9, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 9, 1973, at 2:00 P.M. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; George Carey, Mortimer Fleishhacker, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Thomas J. Mellon, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Alec Bash, Planner III; Edward Michael, Planner III; Linda Skiffer, Planner II; Russell Watson, Planner I; Lois Fishman, Planning Intern; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Robert Bartlett represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The secretary reported that the minutes of the meetings of July 5 and 26 (Regular), 1973, had not been mailed to members of the Commission. They will be re-calendared for approval at the Commission's next regular meeting on August 16, 1973.

CURRENT MATTERS

President Newman, noting that a Charter amendment had been proposed which would exempt the Port from the normal purchasing, leasing, budgeting and fiscal procedures of the City, indicated that there had been some questions as to whether the effect of the amendment would be to exempt the Port from review of its actions for conformity with the Master Plan. He stated that he had been assured by Port officials that that was not their intent; and they had agreed to add clarifying language to the proposed amendment, specifying that actions of the Port would continue to be reviewed by the City Planning Commission for conformity with the Master Plan.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, advised the Commission that a public hearing of the Department of City Planning's proposed work program and budget for the fiscal year 1974-75 has tentatively been scheduled for the meeting of September 20. A public hearing on the Environmental Impact Report on the proposed expansion of the San Francisco International Airport has been scheduled for September 27.

Mr. Murphy advised the Commission that letters had been received from 2 neighbors and from the Dolores Heights Improvement Club requesting that the

Commission undertake a discretionary review of a building application for enlargement of a legal non-conforming use at 336-338 Cumberland Street. He stated that the Commission, on November 16, 1967, had acted unanimously to disapprove a building permit for expansion of the 2-unit building which occupies the property and had recommended that the sub-standard second dwelling unit be eliminated entirely if the owner of the property wished to enlarge the main dwelling unit of the building. In view of the previous history of the case, he recommended that the Commission conduct a discretionary review of the building application during its meeting on August 16.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that a discretionary review of this matter be held next Thursday, August 16.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Board of Supervisors, at its meeting next Monday, will consider the Pacific Heights Association's request for reduction of height limits south of Lafayette Park and in the vicinity of Presbyterian Hospital. She emphasized that the City-wide Height and Bulk ordinance was adopted less than one year ago; and, in view of the fact that favorable action on the Pacific Height Association's request would constitute the first change in the height limits which had been established by the Commission, she felt that the Commission should be represented at the Board's meeting. President Newman said that he would attend the meeting to represent the Commission.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the Pacific Heights Association has been applying pressure on the Board of Supervisors to re-zone all properties in their area to R-2, stated that she had maintained that R-2 zoning in that area would amount to an absolute freeze on all new development; and she indicated that she had asked the staff of the Department of City Planning to provide her with information relating to recent R-2 developments in that area. The information showed that 38 R-2 buildings had been constructed and that 124 R-2 buildings have been demolished in 1970. In 1971, 52 R-2 buildings had been constructed and 78 R-2 buildings had been demolished. In 1972, 38 R-2 buildings had been constructed and 114 R-2 buildings had been demolished. She emphasized that she had supported reclassification of various areas of Pacific Heights where single family dwellings predominate to R-2; however, given the fact that some parts of Pacific Heights constitute the most densely developed residential areas of San Francisco, she did not feel that those areas should be subjected to R-2 zoning. She felt that the individuals urging reclassification of those areas to R-2 should clearly recognize that the effect of such an action would be to put a complete freeze on all new development in those areas.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he supported the position which had been expressed by Commissioner Porter; and he felt that the situation emphasized the need for the City-wide study of residential zoning which is to be undertaken by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

CA73.7 PUBLIC HEARING ON AN APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS IN THE JACKSON SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT TO ERECT A STRUCTURE, APPROXIMATELY 6' BY 10', FOR PHOTO WALK-UP SERVICE AT 601 SANSOME STREET, NORTHWEST CORNER OF WASHINGTON STREET, BEING A PORTION OF LOT 4 IN AN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 196.

Russell Watson, Planner I, reported on this matter as follows:

"This application was filed by Samuel M. Elkins for Photo-stop, Inc.

"The application proposes the construction of a victorian style retail photofinishing building within the Jackson Square Historic District.

"The new photofinishing building will be located on the existing metropolitan parking lot at the northwest corner of Sansome and Washington Streets. This building, which will occupy the corner parking space on the lot, is relocatable and will be placed in such a manner so as to provide a two foot setback from the corner and a small park-like area with trees and benches along Sansome Street. The applicant has selected the 441 Jackson Street building as a model from which to develop the design of the present structure. This design reflects the historic scale and character common to the Jackson Square Historic District. Colors, materials and signs for the building will be compatible with the character of the Historic District. Additionally, the applicant intends to mount a photo essay map of the Historic District on the building facing the park-like area as a public service to both residents and tourists visiting the Jackson Square area.

"The application was filed on May 29, 1973 and reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on June 6, 1973. With five members present the Board by a vote of four ayes adopted Resolution 83, recommending that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the work proposed.

"The Director of Planning reviewed the application on June 6, 1973 and found that because the application proposed a new structure in the Jackson Square Historic District, a public hearing was mandatory under the provisions of Article 10."

Sam Elkins, the applicant, stated that the actual dimensions of the structure would be 5' by 9'. He indicated that the photo-finishing service would be pedestrian-oriented and would not have drive-up facilities; and he felt that the proposed structure would be a delightful focal point in the area. In conclusion, he stated that the building would be movable.

Commissioner Porter asked the applicant if he has a lease on the parking place which will be used for the structure. Mr. Elkins replied in the affirmative, indicating that his lease was dependent upon the parking lot's master lease; and he believed that the parking lot lease is for 5 years with a renewable clause.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the nature of the business which would be housed in the structure. Mr. Elkins replied that film and photo-finishing services would be sold in the structure.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the building would be located within the Jackson Square Historic District, asked if the structure could be demolished or altered without the approval of the Commission. Edward Michael, Planner III, replied that it was likely that a public hearing would be required before the building could be demolished.

Commissioner Porter asked if an Environmental Impact Report would be necessary before the proposed construction. Mr. Michael replied that the Director had determined that an Environmental Impact Report would not be necessary.

President Newman asked about the hours of operation of the proposed business. Mr. Elkins replied that the business would be operated during normal daylight hours.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Murphy recommended the adoption of a draft resolution of approval which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7056 and that the application for a certificate of appropriateness to permit construction of the proposed structure be approved with the proviso that landscaping and permitted signs shall be in general conformity to that indicated on the drawings which had been submitted and subject to final review by the Department of City Planning.

CA73.8 PUBLIC HEARING ON AN APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ERECT A NEW GARAGE STRUCTURE AND TO ENLARGE AN EXISTING STRUCTURE ON THE FOLLOWING DESIGNATED LANDMARK SITE: THE LEALE HOUSE, 2475 PACIFIC AVENUE, SOUTH SIDE, 68.75' EAST OF STEINER STREET, LOT 18 IN AN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 587.

Edward Michael, Planner III, reported on this matter as follows:

"This application was filed by Walker & Moody, Architects, for Mrs. Maryanna Shaw, owner of the property.

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

"The application proposed to:

- 1) Add a new garage approximately 13 x 17 feet at the westerly end of the front property line.
- 2) Add a partial second story on the existing residence and a small addition at the rear of the first floor.
- 3) Relocate the existing steps in the front retaining wall to a new location adjacent to the garage.

"The property has a maximum width of 68.75 feet fronting on Pacific Avenue and a maximum depth of 137.5 feet, with an area of 8265 square feet. The existing and proposed zoning is R-1 and the height limit is 40 feet. A retaining wall four feet high occupies the entire frontage on Pacific Avenue. Above this, the property continues an upward slope to 9 or 10 feet above sidewalk level.

"The existing residence is irregular in shape with overall dimensions of about 40 x 66 feet; it is set back from Pacific Avenue about 28 feet and has a side yard to the west of about 26 feet. The distance from the rear of the structure to the rear property line is about 45 feet and contains two small ancillary structures along the rear property line.

"New construction on the second floor will be set back about 14 feet from the false front of the lower floor. It will also be set back from the rear wall from 6 to 15 feet. No new construction on the second floor level will project beyond the existing walls of the first floor. At the first floor level, the new construction will not project beyond the existing rear wall. A new entry will be provided along the west side but the existing front porch will remain.

"The residence now has no off-street parking and is not required to provide any. The garage has purposely been kept to a length of 17 feet in order to preserve a large tree.

"Detailing of new construction will repeat as closely as possible that of the existing residence.

"This application was filed May 25, 1973, and reviewed by the Landmarks Board on June 20, 1973. With five members present the Board unanimously adopted Resolution 84 recommending that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the work proposed. At that meeting the Pacific Heights Improvements Association supported the proposal contingent that the integrity of the house, as viewed from the street, would be preserved."

L. Chapuis, representing Walker and Moody, architects for the applicant, emphasized that the proposed addition to the building would be invisible as viewed from street level in front of the property.

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Mrs. Frank H. Fries, 2497 Pacific Avenue, stating that any structural change would rob the Leale House of its symbolic beauty and meaning of a very long past. She urged the Commission to exercise its authority to preserve the City's few remaining Landmarks instead of allowing them to be altered or destroyed.

President Newman asked what would happen to the property if the request for a certificate of appropriateness were to be disapproved. Mr. Chapuis stated that the owner of the property has a growing family; and he felt that a refusal of the expansion permit might result in some hardship for the owner. He stated that the building has been added onto twice in its history; however, like the expansion presently being proposed, neither of the two previous additions have been visible from the street.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that the staff had reported that the new second floor would be set back about 14' from the false front of the lower floor; however, the extent of the setback did not appear to be that great on the model which was on display in the meeting room. Mr. Chapuis stated that the model was not accurate.

Mrs. G. Bland Platt, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that Mr. Whisler, a member of her Board, had assured her that the proposed addition could not be seen from the street; otherwise, she indicated that she would not have voted to approve the certificate of appropriateness.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended the adoption of a draft resolution of approval which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the draft resolution be adopted. He remarked that one way to save Landmark buildings is to make them usable; and he felt that the owner of the subject building should be commended for preserving a building which might otherwise have been destroyed.

Commissioner Porter seconded the motion and indicated that she shared the sentiments which had been expressed by Commissioner Fleishhacker.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as a City Planning Resolution No. 7057 and to approve a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed expansion project.

AUGUST 9, 1973

R73.12 PROPERTY ACQUISITION - PORTIONS OF BLOCKS 4351 AND 4382,
ISLAIS CREEK STORM WATER RETENTION BASIN.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The subject parcels are surplus property owned by the State, bounded by Islais Creek turning basin, Southern-Embarcadero Freeway, Army Street and the Cargill, Inc., copra plant. The site is approximately two acres, and is a modified triangle running 650 feet south from a narrow opening on Army Street, reaching a width of 265 feet at the channel.

"The Department of Public Works wants to purchase the site for its Selby Outfall storm water retention basin. This would be largest such basin in the City, projected to range in size from 150' x 187' to 300' x 567' depending upon requirements of the Water Quality Control Board. According to DPW's Environmental Evaluation Form description, it would be a concrete structure, predominantly below grade. We also understand that a large pump house, approximately 40' x 100' would accompany the installation.

"The site is in the heart of an industrial district, zoned M-2 and almost one-half mile from the nearest residentially zoned land on Potrero Hill. The South Bayshore plan designates the area for industry.

"The retention basin seems to be a favorable use of the site. Access at Army Street and visibility therefrom are minimal, making it not the most favorable location for an industrial plant or for heavy in and out traffic. Frontage on the turning basin is preempted by off-shore docking facilities for the Cargill plant. City ownership would allow development of fishing access to the basin shoreline and minor recreational development if the site is appropriate.

"The design of this installation should indicate what can be anticipated in more sensitive surroundings. Therefore we feel that plans for the layout and surface treatment, landscaping, etc., should come before this Commission and the facility should be built and tested before other installations are made elsewhere in the City."

President Newman asked if the proposed facility would be part of the long-term sewage program which had recently been announced. Mr. Gamble replied in the affirmative.

No one was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the proposed project.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that acquisition of the property for the proposed use be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan providing that preliminary and final plans for the facility, including surface treatment and landscaping, be submitted to the Commission for review. He further recommended that construction of the facility should precede design of others so that it can be used as a basis of evaluation.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if it would be practical for the Department of Public Works to complete construction of the proposed facility before proceeding with the design of other similar facilities.

Harold Coffee, representing the Department of Public Works, stated that their schedule requires that work proceed on the design of a dry weather facility to be constructed in the Northern Waterfront; however, he stated that anything done could be submitted to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that it might be wise to alter the wording of the proviso which had been recommended by Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy stated that a committee of the Board of Supervisors which had recently considered the sewage treatment construction program had taken the position that the facility at Islais Creek should be completed before design is begun on similar facilities to be located in more critical areas; and he stated that he was surprised that the Department of Public Works had not advised that committee that work would have to proceed on plans for the facility to be located at Northpoint.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that the proviso recommended by Mr. Murphy should be re-worded to specify that construction of the proposed facility should precede, if possible, the design of other similar facilities.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that acquisition of portions of Blocks 4351 and 4382 for use as a storm water retention basin is in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the preliminary and final plans for the facility, including surface treatment and landscaping, be submitted to the Commission for review. It was further recommended that construction of the proposed facility precede, if possible, design of others so that it can be used as a basis of evaluation.

REVIEW OF BUILDING APPLICATIONS FOR DWELLINGS IN THE MIRA GLEN PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (MALTA DRIVE).

Russell Watson, Planner I, reported on this matter as follows:

"Before you today for your review as a condition of City Planning Resolution 5758, dated March 26, 1964, authorizing a Planned Unit Development of 119 dwelling units at R-1 density, located along Malta Drive, are the final building plans for five single family residences, and five duplex units.

"These dwellings differ somewhat in detail from the original plans submitted in 1964, but are consistent with the general intent of the planned unit development authorized.

"The five single family dwellings, to be developed by the Gaehwiler Construction Co., are three bedrooms, two bath units, selling within the \$60,000 price range. The Duplex units, to be developed by Tuck Investment Co., consist of one primary three bedroom, two bath unit and a one bedroom, one bath rental unit. These dwellings are proposed to sell within the \$75,000 range. The dwellings have been designed to include building setbacks, view protection for adjacent properties, professional landscaping of all open space and setback areas, use of natural building materials and the maximum development of each lot's view potential."

No one in the audience expressed a desire to be heard on this matter. Commissioner Ritchie, noting that other members of the Commission had expressed the opinion earlier in the meeting that R-2 construction is not economical, pointed out that the developer who was planning to construct the proposed duplex units apparently felt differently about the matter.

Commissioner Porter stated that there had been a great deal of concern about the type of buildings which have been constructed in R-3 districts; however, she felt that the duplexes which were presently being proposed would vie with the average R-3 building for being unimaginative and ugly.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if all the buildings being proposed would look alike. A representative of Davis Realty stated that details of the facades would differ.

Mr. Passmore stated that the 10 buildings presently being proposed would be of similar design; however, other buildings in the subdivision which have been constructed by other developers have been designed differently. He emphasized that a high degree of landscaping was required by the Commission resolution authorizing the planned unit development; and he believed that the landscaping would give the proposed buildings a significantly better appearance than indicated in the renderings which had been displayed.

Commissioner Rueda noted that Mr. Watson had indicated that the single family dwellings would sell within the \$60,000 price range; and, if the applicants were required to improve the design of the buildings, the selling price might move upward towards \$100,000.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he shared Commissioner Ritchie's concern about the appearance of the buildings; however, he did not feel that the Commission should presume to tell developers how to design their buildings.

Mr. Passmore stated that the Commission does have control over the design of buildings in a planned unit development.

Mr. Watson stated that design of the proposed buildings was considerably better than that which had originally been submitted to the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Porter remarked that this is 1973; and she suspected that the type of architecture reflected in the design of new buildings will be the same whether the buildings are located in R-1, R-2, or R-3 districts.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the plans be approved as submitted.

At 3:00 P.M. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:05 P.M. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

EE73.68 APPEAL OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PROPOSED 12-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING AT 2011 CALIFORNIA STREET, BLOCK 22A IN AN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 650.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that a letter have been received from Mr. & Mrs. Lord, 2021 California Street, requesting that hearing of this matter be postponed until August 16 or a later date because they were absent from the state.

Steven Swig, attorney for Mr. & Mrs. Lord stated that he had informed counsel for the owners of the subject property of the request for postponement; and he hoped that the postponement would be granted by the Commission.

Wallace Colthurst, attorney for the owner of the subject property, stated that the proposed project had been affected by numerous delays; and, under the circumstances, he hoped that the Commission would act as soon as possible. If the Commission were to postpone consideration of the matter for one week, he hoped that they would take a field trip to the site during the interim to avoid the possibility of further delay for that purpose following the next meeting.

Mr. Steele recommended that a field trip to the property be scheduled prior to the Commission's regular meeting on August 16.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unaimously that consideration of this matter be postponed until the meeting of August 16, 1973.

- 27.11 INNER RICHMOND REZONING - RECLASSIFICATION FROM R-4 AND R-3 TO R-2 AND P (FOR PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES) IN THE AREA GENERALLY BOUNDED BY GEARY AND ARGUELLO BOULEVARDS, FULTON STREET AND FUNSTON AVENUE.

(Under advisement of meeting for July 19, 1973.)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the staff had made its recommendation on the application known to the Commission and the public during the meeting on July 19. Since that time, additional factors and evidence had been given consideration; and, as a result, the staff wished to modify its recommendation with regard to properties located on Fulton Street west of 5th Avenue. Previously, the staff had recommended that those properties be re-classified to R-3; however, it was now the recommendation of the staff that those properties should retain their present R-4 zoning. In addition, residents of the neighborhood had expressed concern about the staff's recommendation for R-3 zoning along 8th and 9th Avenues between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets; and he stated that they had indicated a desire to make a special presentation to the Commission regarding that area.

Roger Bernhardt, 662-9th Avenue, submitted a petition which had been signed by 70 residents of the block of 9th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets in support of R-2 zoning for their area. He stated that 24 of the signators were property owners; and he indicated that they represented 73% of the property owners in the block. He indicated that he had previously lived on Congo Street, which is a single family area; and he stated that he had moved because of the lack of activity in that neighborhood. The 600 block of 9th Avenue, on the other hand, has 82 dwelling units in a mixture of building types, including new apartments; and, as a result, the block has lots of kids and lots of activity. He advised the Commission that only three property owners in the block had refused to sign the petition because they felt that the resale value of their properties would be less if they were zoned R-2; but the property owners who had signed the petition in support of the request for rezoning had indicated that they were doing so because of their concern for the quality of life in their neighborhood. Thus, for some people the Richmond District is a place to live while for others it is a place to make a profit. He stated that he did not wish property values in the area to decrease; and he did not believe that R-2 zoning would have that effect. However, his principal concern was with the quality of life in the neighborhood. He also emphasized that many tenants had signed the petition in support of the rezoning to R-2; and he advised the Commission that some of the tenants have resided in the area for longer than the 7 years that he has lived in the block. He stated that his wife had made a survey of the rents which are paid by 15 tenants in the block and had found that the average rental rate is \$162.00 per unit. He informed the Commission that new apartments in the area are renting for \$185.00 to \$200.00; and he believed that new construction of that sort would drive middle class people out of the area. He apologized for the fact that he had not submitted his material to the staff of the Department of City

Planning at an earlier date; however, he had encountered members of the staff on a field trip in the area on the previous afternoon and had advised them of his concern. At that time, they had asked him if he felt it would be wise to retain R-3 zoning for properties located on 8th Avenue or whether he felt that it would be preferable to eliminate the entire R-3 district in that area. As a result, he had made a last minute survey of 8th Avenue and had obtained 48 signatures, including the signatures of 10 property owners, in support of re-classification to R-2. He also advised the Commission that 31 of the 38 property zoned R-3 on Cabrillo Street and on 8th Avenue, or 82% of the total number of properties, are developed with 1- or 2- unit buildings. He stated that he had not made a survey of the R-3 properties located on Balboa Street; however, if the rest of the area were to be rezoned to R-2, he felt that it was logical that the entire R-3 "island" should be eliminated.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that Mr. Bernhardt's property is located next door to a 5-unit building; and he asked him if he objected to that building.

Mr. Bernhardt replied that he would probably prefer that the building not be constructed if it were being proposed today; however, in view of the fact that rents in the building are reasonable and that the tenants in the building have been there for a number of years, his objections to it were not strong. Nevertheless, he did feel that the apartment building which had been constructed at 670-9th Avenue is detrimental to the area. In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker as to the basis of his objection to that building, Mr. Bernhardt stated that he had a number of objections to the building including its lack of a front set-back, its anonymity, its facade design, its recessed entryway, its high rent which keeps out families with children, and all of the other factors which have kept it from becoming integrated with the rest of the block. He stated that children on the block have thrown stones at the building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that the same type of construction would probably have occurred if the property had been zoned R-2; and rental rates would have been higher.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that the building which had previously occupied the property would probably not have been torn down if the property had been zoned R-2.

Commissioner Porter remarked that it was apparent that Mr. Bernhardt wished his neighborhood to remain unchanged and that he believed that reclassification of the properties to R-2 would give assurance that there will be no change.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was of the opinion that the Commission should not be influenced by the rental structure in the block as indicated on the survey sheet which had been submitted by Mr. Bernhardt. Personally, he did not regard uniformity of rental rates to be a governing factor.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that he did not disagree with Commissioner Ritchie. However, since some people had contended that reclassification to R-2 would keep lower class families out of the neighborhood, he attempted to demonstrate to the Commission that R-3 construction does, in effect, exclude the lower classes while R-2 construction does not.

Mr. Steele stated that the staff, based on the information which had been made available by Mr. Bernhardt, was prepared to recommend that the R-3 district along 8th and 9th Avenues between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets should be re-classified from R-3 to R-2.

Jeanne Hinesley, 573-7th Avenue, remarked that she had been quoted in yesterday's edition of the Progress as stating that the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning concerning the subject application was a reasonable compromise; and, with the modifications which had just been proposed by Mr. Steele, she felt that the staff's recommendation was really a reasonable compromise. She stated that she had taken a walk along Arguello Boulevard and Fulton Street, both of which are very busy thoroughfares; and she agreed with the staff of the Department of City Planning that properties along those streets could handle higher density development. She also observed that there are a greater number of apartment buildings in the vicinity of Geary Boulevard; and she believed that construction of additional housing units in the vicinity of French Hospital would be good insofar as it would provide employees of the hospital with an opportunity to live in buildings from which they could walk to work. Under the circumstances, she felt that the staff recommendation for retention of R-2 zoning in that area was reasonable. She also understood that certain properties in the remainder of the area, if zoned to R-2, would still be eligible for transitional use status. Mr. Steele explained that Section 203.2 (e) of the City Planning Code "specifies that multiple dwellings, as permitted and regulated in an R-3 district, can be approved as conditional uses in R-2 district when on each of the adjoining lots there already exists a dwelling legally non-conforming by R-2 standards as to the number of dwelling units therein, in which case the Commission may authorize a multiple dwelling so long as the number of dwelling units therein does not exceed 1 for each 800 square feet of lot area."

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that Section 203.2 (f) of the City Planning Code provides that multiple dwellings, as permitted and regulated in an R-3 district, may be approved as conditional uses in an R-2 district when more than 1/2 of the R-2 street frontage in the same block and on the same side of the street is occupied by dwellings legally non-conforming by R-2 standards as to the number of dwelling units therein, in which case the Commission may authorize a multiple dwelling so long as the number of dwelling units therein does not exceed 1 for each 800 square feet of lot area. He felt that that section of the Code might apply to properties on 9th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets.

Mrs. Hinesley stated that residents of the subject neighborhood had never really been anti-growth. She indicated that she had covered most of the reasons

for filing the subject application during the hearing on July 19; however, one of the things which she had forgotten to stress at that time is that the area covered by the subject application encompasses a completed FACE area and that properties to the west of that completed project have been considered for designation as a new FACE area. She stated that she knows a number of people who reside on 9th Avenue; and she had felt that they would be concerned about the staff's July 19th recommendation that the R-3 zoning of their properties remain unchanged; therefore, she was pleased that Mr. Steele had modified his recommendation to include those properties in the new R-2 district. She stated that she had found the staff to be most patient and cooperative; and she felt that the staff's recommendations met the basic concerns of residents of the neighborhood.

Marie Poitz, 1024 Anza Street, stated that a pleasant 2-story apartment building had been constructed at Anza Street and Arguello Boulevard. However, last fall a new 3-story apartment building was constructed; and she regarded that building as a prime example of what an apartment building can do to ruin a block. In view of the fact that several of the apartment units in the new building remained unrented, she felt that the building could have been smaller; and, if it had been limited in height to two stories, it would have fitted into the context of the block much better. As it is, however, the building "sits there like an Empire State Building in a field of mushrooms." One of the worst features of the building is that it leaves her nothing to look at from her property except two blank walls. She urged that the subject application be approved so that construction of buildings such as the one which she had described would not be possible in the neighborhood in the future.

Edith Hedlund, 438-8th Avenue, stated that she was pleased that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that her property retain its present R-3 zoning. However, she was concerned about the effect which proposed state legislation establishing a residential code enforcement program would have on people such as herself who live on a fixed income.

Michael McCormac, President of the San Francisco Real Estate Board, read and submitted the following prepared statement:

"I urge your denial of the application before you today as it is just another piecemeal approach for the solution of a very complex problem. Downzoning has definite economic and social effects on the City as a whole, and you, as a commission, must keep the welfare of the total community in mind when rendering a decision.

"It amazes me that the commission has never called upon the Assessor for facts concerning the effect of downzoning on the revenue to the City. Also, facts concerning the needs for future housing and the type of housing needed should be provided the commission for evaluation.

"Too many of the decisions of this commission have been influenced by a well organized, vocal minority supposedly representing the majority of residents in any area under consideration of downzoning. Because of lack of information, inconvenience of daytime hearings, or apathy the silent majority is seldom heard from. I submit that there must be a means for these persons to be heard; maybe by a polling by mail."

"The director of City Planning has recently been quoted in the news as suggesting that a total re-evaluation of zoning for the City as a whole should be made. We wholeheartedly support this suggestion and have even suggested same in prior testimony before this commission. I believe this type of action would far be the better means of determining what neighborhoods want and what the City as a whole could and should have to satisfy the needs for the present and future health of the City."

Travis Campbell, owner of property in the subject neighborhood, felt that the Commission should hold a meeting in the area before taking action on the subject application.

Al Bartal, 621-9th Avenue, stated that most of the new buildings which have been constructed in the neighborhood have replaced condemned houses. He indicated that he sells electrical supplies; and, as a result, he knew that most of the older buildings in the area are fire traps. He stated that his family also has an interest in property located on 4th Avenue near Balboa Street. With R-4 zoning, that property has a value of approximately \$30,000; however, if it were to be rezoned to R-2, it would have a value of only \$15,000. It was not clear to him whether the people who were supporting the subject application were opposed only to R-3 construction or if they were opposed to all construction in general; if the latter, their concerns might be satisfied in 1974 if the City fails to meet required sewage standards, resulting in a moratorium on all new construction. He felt that the recommendation of the staff was a far cry better than what had been requested by the applicants; however, he felt that the matter could still stand a great deal more consideration. He emphasized that many of the older buildings in the area provide no off-street parking spaces; yet, very few of the buildings in his own block on 9th Avenue are in peril of being torn down because they are worth more than the \$44,000 maximum limit which builders can afford to pay for property.

John Maloney, owner of property on 5th Avenue, stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that his property be reclassified to R-2; but he preferred for it to retain its present R-3 zoning. In his opinion, new buildings help to improve a neighborhood; and, if properties in the subject area were to be reclassified to R-2, he anticipated that existing "shacks" would continue to stand. He remarked that Mrs. Hinesley had stated that she had found the staff of the Department of City Planning to be most cooperative; and he felt that the staff should be just as cooperative with opponents of an application as

with the applicants. He believed that Mr. Steele had submitted plans for the re-zoning to the applicants before the application had ever been filed.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Maloney if he was inferring that the proposed re-zoning had originated with the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Maloney replied in the affirmative and stated that he believed that the re-zoning had been planned 1 or 1½ years ago.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was certain that Mr. Steele had not gone into the neighborhood gratuitously to encourage re-zoning. She observed that a strong neighborhood group (PAR) has been active in the Richmond District for the past several years; and she assumed that Mr. Steele had been invited into the neighborhood by that group to provide them with technical information about zoning.

Mr. Steele confirmed that he had been asked on several occasions to attend meetings of the Planning Area for the Richmond (PAR); and he indicated that a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning has been assigned to attend meetings of that group to answer planning questions which might arise. He stated that the Department tries to give the same sort of consideration to all people who come to the Department whether they come in support of or in opposition to a re-zoning application.

President Newman remarked that it was apparent Mr. Maloney was unequivocally opposed to the proposed reclassification.

Dan O'Neill, owner of a vacant partial property at Balboa Street and Third Avenue, stated that his property had previously been occupied by a service station which he had removed 6 months ago with the intention of constructing a nice apartment building on the site. The staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the property be reclassified from R-4 to R-2; and, although he had invested \$41,000 in the property to date, he doubted that it would be worth more than \$15,000 if the reclassification to R-2 were to be approved. He stated that Balboa Street carries a tremendous flow of traffic, particularly during the evening rush hour; and, given the nature of existing development along the street, he could see no reason for re-zoning properties along the street to R-2. If he had not been required by the Department of Public Health to remove the gas station from the property, he would have been able to rent it for approximately \$250.00 per month. However, since the property is vacant and since a "moratorium" on R-4 construction went into effect when the subject application was filed, he had been able to do nothing with the property.

Mr. Steele stated that Mr. O'Neill's property has transitional status since it is located adjacent to a commercial district; and, as a result, it could be developed to an R-3 density even if it were to be re-zoned to R-2.

Mr. O'Neill stated that permission to build to R-3 density would be of no value to him in view of what he had paid for his property.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how many dwelling units could be built on Mr. O'Neill's property under his present R-4 zoning. Mr. O'Neill replied that 9 units would be permitted; however, he had intended to construct only 6 or 8 units in a two-floor building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked if more than 3 units could be built on the property if R-3 density were permitted. Mr. O'Neill replied in the negative, indicating that his lot measures only 25 feet by 95 feet.

Mr. Campbell remarked that no Chinese or black people were present in the audience. Commissioner Porter stated that she had had a number of letters from people with oriental names.

Mr. Steele confirmed that the Department of City Planning had received a great deal of mail from individuals with oriental surnames; and he indicated that the location of properties which they occupy and their reactions to the proposed reclassification were indicated on a map which had been posted on the wall of the meeting room. He remarked that R-2 buildings in R-2 zones in code enforcement areas are nearly always brought up to code as opposed to being replaced; however, when such properties are zoned R-3 rather than R-2, the economics of the situation tend to encourage demolition and replacement of the older buildings. He felt that adoption of his recommendation would establish an appropriate zoning pattern for the subject neighborhood; and he emphasized that his recommendation did entail reclassification of a considerable amount of R-4 and R-3 property to R-2 and to P.

Commissioner Rueda stated that it seemed to him that it would be desirable to retain R-3 zoning for properties located on Fulton Street west of the commercial district at 8th Avenue. He emphasized that those properties are located across the street from Golden Gate Park and enjoy good public transportation; and, if they were permitted to retain their R-3 zoning, they would allow for some development and growth in the neighborhood.

Mr. Steele stated that the Commission could modify his recommendation in any matter which it saw fit. He emphasized, however, that the potential for growth in the subject neighborhood would still be substantial even if his recommendation were to be approved. Under existing zoning, the density of the neighborhood could be increased by 6,500 dwelling units. Under the zoning which he had proposed, the density of the area could be increased by 4,400 units. He stated that the neighborhood has only 3,730 dwelling units at the present time.

Commissioner Rueda felt that the proposed reclassification would be geared toward minimizing any development whatsoever instead of allowing and encouraging growth; and he noted that the Commission had already approved similar "down zonings" in other neighborhoods of the City. He emphasized that the subject neighborhood has wide streets, is located close to park space, and has numerous public facilities; and he felt that the neighborhood, particularly along streets such as Balboa and Fulton Streets, could accommodate higher density.

Mr. Steele stated that some of the properties fronting on Fulton Street are already zoned R-1; and many properties along the street abut an R-2 district. Again, he stated that he believed that his recommendation for re-zoning would still allow sufficient leeway for future growth in the area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the growth projection figures which Mr. Steele had cited had taken into account the additional dwelling units which might be permitted by conditional use authorization from the Commission or because of transitional status. Mr. Steele replied in the negative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker acknowledged that the number of additional dwelling units which will be permitted by those factors would be difficult to estimate; however, in view of the fact that almost all of the properties on 9th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets could be developed to R-3 density if conditional use authorization were granted by the Commission, the number of additional dwelling units which could be authorized throughout the entire neighborhood might be significant. He asked Mr. Steele if he could give a rough estimate of the number of additional units which might be permitted under those circumstances. Mr. Steele replied that as many as 1,000 additional dwelling units might be permitted as a result of transitional use or conditional use considerations.

Commissioner Porter remarked that R-3 zoning has always been a problem. Although the density standards for the R-3 district were changed from 400 square feet of land area for each dwelling unit to 800 square feet of land area for each dwelling unit in 1963, buildings incompatible with their surroundings have continued to be constructed in R-3 districts. While it might be possible for a block to absorb one incompatible R-3 building, construction of three or more R-3 buildings in a single block often results in a development pattern which is not good in R-3 terms or in R-2 terms. She emphasized that the general pattern of the subject neighborhood is characterized by low-density development; and she remarked that the recommendation of the staff would not lower the density of the neighborhood but would result in preservation of the present character of the area.

Mr. Steele stated that 75% of the area is presently developed to R-1 to R-2 standards at the present time; and he indicated that the zoning pattern which he had recommended would allow for a considerable increase in the density of the neighborhood. He felt that higher density development would be especially desirable near the Geary Corridor.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the subject application be approved in part and disapproved in part as recommended by Mr. Steele.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he was not terribly happy about approaching the problem of neighborhood re-zoning on a piecemeal basis; and he stated that he would not have been willing to vote for the proposed reclassification if it were not for the fact that the Department of City Planning is scheduled

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

The following is a list of the names of the members of the American Medical Association who have been elected to the office of President for the year 1900.

to conduct a City-wide survey of residential zoning which will give consideration to the problem of making new construction in R-2 districts economically feasible. He remarked that it was obvious that many people are of the opinion that R-3 zoning is not good for family residential neighborhoods; but he felt that they should realize that R-2 zoning effectively rules out any new development whatsoever. He hoped that the Department of City Planning's City-wide residential zoning study would help to resolve that dilemma.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5 to 1 to adopt resolution No. 7058 and to approve the subject application in part and to disapprove the application in part as recommended by Mr. Steele.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

ABJ

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 16, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 16, 1973, at 1:30 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; George Carey, Thomas J. Mellon, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); John Phair, City Planning Coordinator; Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning); Ronald Jonash, Planner III; Alec Bash, Planner III; Robert De Velbiss, Planner III (Zoning); Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Wilbert Hardee, Planner II; Glenda Skiffer, Planner II; Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II; Linda Ferbert, Planner I; Russell Watson, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:30 P.M. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:30 p.m. to take a field trip to 2011 California Street which ~~was to be the subject of a matter to be considered later in the afternoon.~~ Commissioner Ritchie attended the field trip but was absent from the remainder of the meeting.

2:15 P.M., 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of July 5, 19, and 26, (Regular), 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, reported that the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Monday, had postponed consideration of the proposal to reduce established height limits in two areas of Pacific Heights. The matter is scheduled to be considered next Monday, August 20.

AUGUST 16, 1973

Mr. Murphy advised the Commission that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting next Tuesday afternoon, will consider the Commission's proposed reclassification of property on "Kite Hill" from R-3 to R-1.

CONSIDERATION OF ENDORSEMENT OF FINAL REPORT ON HAIGHT-ASHBURY

George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, introduced Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II, who presented and summarized a memorandum entitled "Revisions to the Haight-Ashbury Final Report." The memorandum contained the following proposals for amendment of the final report on the Haight-Ashbury district:

"The following revisions are proposed. (Portions underlined indicate revisions.)

"Housing Conditions Recommendation 3 (P. 4):

"The following sentence should be added at the end of paragraph 2:
'The area between Waller, Fulton, Stanyan and Baker Streets should be considered a 'high priority' area for future inclusion into the RAP program.'

"Community Facilities Recommendation 3 (P. 6):

"a) The Institutional Expansion policy should be amended to read as follows: 'As a general rule, there should be no facility expansion beyond present land holdings. All development should conform to the Master Plans to be submitted by the institutions and approved, after public hearing, by the City Planning Commission.'

"b) The following sentence should be added as the first sentence in the descriptive text following the Recommendation: 'Institutional Master Plans should take into account the needs of the Haight-Ashbury community, including, but not limited to, the need to maintain an adequate supply of low- and moderate-priced housing, the need to reduce traffic congestion and the demand for parking, and the need to provide medical and social services to the community insofar as possible.'

"Haight Street Recommendation 1 (P. 8):

"The following sentence should be added at the beginning of paragraph 2: 'Haight Street should serve primarily the needs of residents of the Haight-Ashbury; however, to achieve economic vitality the street must also attract shoppers from a larger area.'

"Transportation Public Transit Policy Recommendation 3 (P. 12):

"The following sentence should be added at the beginning of the paragraph following the Recommendation: 'The extension should be undertaken only after measures have been formulated in conjunction with the community to minimize the potential adverse impact on the neighborhood during the construction period.'"

President Newman stated that he had received a letter from Ed Dunn, President of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC), requesting that the final report's policy statement on hospital and university expansion be amended to specify that no further expansion would be permitted; and he asked if the modification being proposed by the staff would satisfy HANC's request. Mr. Williams replied in the negative, indicating that the staff was recommending that future expansion of the hospitals and universities be limited to their present land holdings, whereas HANC was proposing a flat prohibition on future expansion. He stated that the hospitals and universities are needed facilities; however, the staff was concerned that the expansion of those facilities should not be at the expense of the neighborhood in which they are located.

Commissioner Porter asked how long it is likely to be before the Muni subway can be extended from the West Portal of the Sunset tunnel to 9th Avenue. After Mr. Williams had replied that it was unlikely that the project would be undertaken within the next ten years, Commissioner Porter remarked that residents of the neighborhood who had expressed concern about that project should be made aware of the fact that it will not be undertaken in the immediate future. She observed that it might be possible to implement many of the recommended policies during the interim; and she felt that it would be unfortunate if the report were to be repudiated on the basis of a project which is not likely to occur for at least 10 years.

President Newman stated that the letter from Mr. Dunn had also indicated that the members of HANC felt that the staff report put far too much stress on turning Haight Street into a regional shopping street; and he asked if the changes being recommended by the staff would bring the policies in the report into line with Mr. Dunn's thinking. Mr. Williams replied that the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council had possibly misunderstood the staff recommendation concerning Haight Street. The staff had not recommended that Haight Street should be turned into a regional shopping center; rather, the staff had observed that Haight Street will have to attract a wider market if it is to regain economic viability.

Commissioner Porter stated that the Commission could not enforce a policy statement to the effect that Haight Street should not become a regional shopping center since private enterprise and economic considerations are involved; however, it would be possible for the Commission to adopt a policy statement to the effect that it would not be desirable for Haight Street to become a regional shopping center.

Mrs. Anna Guth, representing the Haight-Ashbury Improvement Association, formerly known as the Haight-Ashbury Merchants Association, objected to a suggestion that the activities of the merchants on Haight Street should be restricted in any way. She felt that anyone wishing to shop on the street should be allowed to do so; and she believed that any statements in the staff report which would tend to discourage shoppers from doing business on Haight Street should be deleted.

David Finn, a realtor, remarked that the Department of City Planning's survey of the commercial activity on Haight Street had been based on erroneous considerations. He stated that none of his clients would think of going to Haight Street to

shop since the street attracts only transient types. However, he predicted that the character of the neighborhood is changing as more homes in the area are becoming owner-occupied; and he believed that merchants on Haight Street will be encouraged to take steps to attract those people as opposed to the welfare-transient types which presently frequent the street.

Henrietta Abrams stated that many people who own property in the neighborhood had not received copies of the staff report. She also advised the Commission that she had not been afraid to shop on Haight Street; and she felt that the character of the street should remain unchanged.

Gerta Fulder, 206 Edgewood Avenue, remarked that Haight Street is famous and has good possibilities for becoming a vital shopping street; however, what the street really needs at the present time is an "anchor" tenant.

Susan Bierman, a member of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, stated that approximately 40 members of her organization had attended a meeting last week and had passed a motion expressing their concern about the re-location problem which would develop if the Rehabilitation Assistance Program proposed in the staff report were to be undertaken. She stated that poor people need a place to live; and, in view of the fact that many poor people live in the Haight-Ashbury area, she felt that the Commission should not come into the neighborhood with "too heavy a hand."

David Finn stated that he, also, is a member of the Haight-Ashbury Council; and he advised the Commission that property owners who are members of that group favor the staff's proposal for a Rehabilitation Assistance Program to rejuvenate the neighborhood.

Mrs. Abrams stated that most of the people residing in the neighborhood were not aware of what had been proposed; and, if they were, she believed that they would be opposed to the proposal for a Rehabilitation Assistance Program in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Porter asked if there would be time for further discussion and education before funds are available for a Rehabilitation Assistance Program. Mr. Williams replied in the affirmative, indicating that the Director of Planning had forwarded a letter to the Chief Administrative Officer recommending that the upper Ashbury district be designated as a Rehabilitation Assistance Program area. The Chief Administrative Officer will make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; and, subsequently, action must be taken on the matter by that body.

Commissioner Porter asked if Federal funds would be available to assist property owners who will be required to bring their properties up to code standards. Mr. Williams replied that Federal funds will probably not be available; however, local efforts are being made to provide a substitute financial program.

Commissioner Porter, noting that Mrs. Bierman had expressed concern about re-location of people in the lower Haight-Ashbury district, asked if properties in that area had been included within the boundaries of the proposed Rehabilitation Assistance

AUGUST 16, 1973

Program. Mr. Williams replied in the negative; however, he indicated that 80% of the dwellings in the lower Haight-Ashbury are being inspected under the City's Systematic Code Enforcement Program.

Commissioner Mellon emphasized that the purpose of code enforcement is to provide safe and healthful housing and to eliminate wiring defects and other fire hazards. The intent of the proposed Rehabilitation Assistance Program is to make it as easy as possible for property owners to bring their buildings up to code standards and to limit dislocation.

President Newman stated that he had served for 4 years on the Housing Appeals Board; and he advised the Commission that that Board took every step possible to extend forgiveness and to approve extension of payments when property owners were having difficulty financially.

Mr. Murphy recommended an adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared with the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission does hereby endorse the policies and recommendations of the final report entitled 'Haight-Ashbury Improvements' as modified by the memorandum of August 16, 1973;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Planning Commission authorizes and requests the Director of Planning to take the appropriate steps, in concert with the community, to carry out the recommendations of the final report."

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7059.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION LOCATED AT 336-338
CUMBERLAND STREET NO. 423262 FOR ALTERATION OF THE BUILDING

G. David Horn, attorney for the applicant, stated that he had just become aware of the discretionary review; and he indicated that he had not had sufficient time to prepare a presentation on behalf of his client. He hoped to have an opportunity to work out the difficulties with residents of the neighborhood; and he also wished to explore an apparent conflict between two sections of the City Planning Code. He stated that he was leaving shortly for San Diego and would not return until August 27; and, since he would then need time to confer with the City Attorney, he requested that consideration of the permit application by the Commission be deferred until September 13.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the applicant had requested that the matter be calendared for consideration during the Commission's meeting last week; and, under the circumstances, he did not understand why the applicant's attorney had just been notified of the hearing.

Mr. Horn stated that there must have been a communications gap between him and his client; and he doubted that his client would have been prepared to have had the matter heard by the Commission at its last meeting.

At the request of President Newman, Mr. Murphy summarized the background of the case. He stated that the matter had a history before the City Planning Commission dating back to November, 1967. The building at 336-338 Cumberland Street is a legal non-conforming two-family dwelling in an R-1 district. In 1967, the Commission, under its discretionary review powers, unanimously denied an application to enlarge the floor area of the building. At that time, the Commission stated that the sub-standard second dwelling unit should be eliminated entirely if the owner wished to enlarge the main dwelling unit of the building. In 1971, a building permit was issued to Mr. Moore, the owner of the property, which had the approval of the neighbors. That application did not indicate an expansion of the basement area. In 1972, an application was filed which included corrective work on the foundations at 161 Henry Street. That application was approved by the Department of City Planning as being in accord with the multiple family zoning provisions of the Planning Code for that address. Subsequent to that approval by the Department, the address on the application was changed to 336-338 Cumberland Street without referral back to the Department. When the neighbors saw the extent of the work being done under the permit, three letters had been sent to the Department of City Planning on June 18 requesting that the matter be made the subject of a discretionary review by the City Planning Commission.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), stated that he had met briefly with the applicant and his attorney at that time. He had discussed the possibility of a meeting between the applicant and representatives of the neighborhood; however, although he believed that some effort had been made by the applicant to communicate with the neighbors, he did not know the results of those exchanges. Two weeks ago he had received a call from Mr. Moore inquiring about the status of the application and requesting that it be brought before the Commission immediately. As a result, the matter had been calendared for discussion during today's meeting.

President Newman asked Mr. Horn if he had been involved in the expansion project since its inception. Mr. Horn replied in the negative, indicating that he had become involved just before the meeting which had been held with Mr. Passmore in June.

Robert Archibald, representing the Bureau of Building Inspection, summarized a series of permit applications for building alterations on the subject property which had been filed since 1965, a number of which have been canceled. One of the most recent permits indicated some foundation work under the structure; however, in response to a call from residents of the area, he had visited the site and had found that excavations have been made to a depth of more than 9 feet. Such excavation requires engineering approval; but such approval had not been obtained. He had requested the applicant to file a complete set of plans indicating all of his intentions; but the plans had never been received.

President Newman stated that he had been advised by the staff that work had proceeded on the property in spite of the fact that a discretionary review had been requested by residents of the neighborhood; and he asked if construction would stop if the Commission were to take the matter under advisement until the meeting of September 13.

The American Medical Association is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine and the health of the people. It is composed of members who are physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health care professionals. The Association's primary concern is the advancement of the medical profession and the improvement of the health of the community. It achieves this through various means, including the publication of journals, the holding of conferences, and the provision of educational programs. The Association also advocates for the interests of the medical profession in relation to government policy and legislation. Its efforts are directed towards the betterment of the medical profession and the health of the nation.

The Association's activities are carried out through its various departments and committees. These include the Department of Education, the Department of Publications, the Department of Legislation, and the Department of International Relations. Each of these departments is responsible for a specific area of the Association's work. The Department of Education is responsible for the development and delivery of educational programs. The Department of Publications is responsible for the production and distribution of the Association's journals and other publications. The Department of Legislation is responsible for the monitoring and advocacy of medical legislation. The Department of International Relations is responsible for the Association's interactions with other medical organizations around the world.

The Association's financial resources are derived from a variety of sources, including membership dues, contributions from individuals and organizations, and income from the sale of its publications. These resources are used to support the Association's various activities and to ensure the continued growth and development of the medical profession.

The Association's commitment to the advancement of the medical profession and the improvement of the health of the people is unwavering. It continues to work tirelessly to promote the science and art of medicine and to ensure that the highest standards of medical care are maintained. Through its various activities and programs, the Association remains dedicated to the betterment of the medical profession and the health of the nation.

The Association's efforts are a testament to the dedication and commitment of its members and staff. It is through their collective efforts that the Association is able to achieve its goals and to continue to serve the medical profession and the health of the people. The Association's work is a continuous process, and it remains committed to the pursuit of excellence in all of its activities.

AUGUST 16, 1973

Mr. Archibald stated that he had permitted work to continue on the site out of concern for the safety of an adjacent building.

Commissioner Porter noted that the building occupying the property is already a legal non-conforming use; and she remarked that an excavation for a basement with a height of 9 feet would give people a reason to suspect that the basement might be used for another dwelling unit or for some other illegal purpose. She believed that that was the reason that residents of the neighborhood were concerned about the project.

Mr. Horn stated that one of the things which he wished to do prior to September 13 was to put together a summary of reasons why it would be impossible for people to live in the basement area. He stated that his client wished to have a workshop with an eight-foot ceiling in the basement.

Jay Pfotenhauer, 349 Cumberland Street, stated that he had spoken with Mr. Horn during the latter part of June and had been advised that a dialogue concerning the matter would be welcomed. He believed that the background memorandum which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning was factual and complete; and he remarked that Mr. Archibald had apprised the Commission of numerous permit violations which had been committed by the applicant. While he could appreciate the applicant's reasons for requesting a continuance, he was convinced that construction work on the property would not stop during the interim. He advised the Commission that cement trucks had made deliveries up until 6:00 p.m. the previous afternoon; and he did not believe that the present work on the site is related to safety measures since the building was shored up several weeks ago. He indicated that the applicant is employed as a building inspector by the Bureau of Architecture; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the applicant should have been aware of proper permit procedures. In conclusion, he stated that he would oppose the request for continuance unless the Commission could guarantee that work on the project would cease during the interim.

Mr. Horn stated that his client had met with Mr. Archibald and had agreed to halt work on the site except that which would be necessary for the safety of the adjoining building. He assumed that his client would honor that agreement. If not, he would not be a party to his client's actions.

Mr. Archibald stated that it was his opinion that the building is in somewhat of a hazardous state at the present time. He remarked that the rainy season usually begins when schools reopen in the fall; and if the property should be subjected to rainfall in its present state, the building on the adjacent property might be endangered.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that he would request Mr. Goldberg of the Bureau of Building Inspection to revoke all outstanding permits for the property with the exception of those determined by Mr. Archibald to be necessary for safety purposes if the matter were to be taken under advisement by the Commission.

Published weekly, except during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December, when it is published bi-weekly.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies, 15 cents. Entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1910, under post office number 384, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

Copyright, 1911, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is published weekly, except during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are 15 cents. The Journal is entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1910, under post office number 384, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement. It is accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postage is paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. Copyright, 1911, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is published weekly, except during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are 15 cents. The Journal is entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1910, under post office number 384, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement. It is accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postage is paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. Copyright, 1911, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is published weekly, except during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are 15 cents. The Journal is entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1910, under post office number 384, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement. It is accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postage is paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. Copyright, 1911, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is published weekly, except during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are 15 cents. The Journal is entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1910, under post office number 384, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement. It is accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1918. Postage is paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. Copyright, 1911, by The American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

President Newman asked if the action proposed by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Moore replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Rueda that the matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of September 13 with the understanding that all construction work on the site would cease during the interim except for that work which, in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator and the Bureau of Building Inspection, is necessary for the safety of adjacent property. Commissioner Rueda requested that all permits except for those related to safety be rescinded and that the applicant be instructed to file new permits for consideration on September 13 so that the members of the Commission would have a clear understanding of what is actually before them.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to continue this matter until its regular meeting on September 13, 1973. The Commission specified that all construction work on the site shall cease during the interim except for that work which, in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator and the Bureau of Building Inspection, is necessary for the safety of adjacent property. The Commission also requested that plans be available by September 13 with sufficient detail to clarify the actual intentions of the applicant.

EE73.68 - APPEAL OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION - 12-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING;
2011 CALIFORNIA STREET, LOT 22A IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 650.

Alec Bash, Planner III, stated that the applicant proposed to construct a 12-unit apartment building consisting of one- and two-bedroom units in a structure consisting of three floors over a parking garage. The site, which has a total area of 5,156 square feet, presently contains several large trees; and the building, as proposed, would require removal of the trees. The Director of Planning had issued a Negative Declaration for the proposed project on July 6; and that action had been appealed by residents of the neighborhood whose major concern was related to loss of the trees and to the loss of light, air, and views from windows in the building located on the west side of the property.

President Newman advised members of the audience that the Commission had taken a field trip to the property earlier in the afternoon.

John Lord, 2021 California Street, stated that he hoped that some of the foliage on the subject property could be retained along the property line so that views from his building would at least be softened by some greenery. He stated that a large avocado tree is growing within 4 feet of the property line; and he felt that that tree should be preserved if at all possible. In addition, two other trees exist within 5 feet of the property line; and he believed that it would be desirable if those trees could be preserved, also. He stated that the trees are higher than his building; and he emphasized that they would be difficult to replace.

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

Commissioner Rueda asked if the trees would be visible from the street if a building were to be constructed on the property or if they would only be visible from the adjacent building. Mr. Lord replied that the trees could be visible from the street depending upon the type of alterations which the applicant might be willing to make in his plans.

Craig Beckstead, 2026 California Street, stated that he felt very strongly about the need for preserving trees. He indicated that he and other residents of the neighborhood feel that it has a unique character; and, in view of the price which had been paid for the subject property, he believed that the applicant must feel the same way. He felt that the applicant should be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Study for the proposed project; and, if it were not too late to appeal a Negative Declaration which had been issued for another project at California and Laguna Streets, he felt that an Environmental Impact Report should be required for that project, also.

President Newman inquired about the basis of the staff's decision to issue a Negative Declaration for the proposed project.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the staff had considered the effects which the specific building being proposed would have on the neighborhood in general, that particular section of the City, and the City as a whole; and the staff had advised the Director that it did not appear that the proposed building would have a significant impact in any one of the three categories. On that basis, the Director had issued a Negative Declaration; and notice of the Negative Declaration had been sent adjacent property owners.

Wallace Colthurst, representing Mr. Gaehwiler, the applicant, stated that he had requested the Commission to take a field trip to the site since he felt that there is no better way to determine what the impact of a proposed project might be; and he indicated that he had also brought photographs of the property for the Commissioners to see. He stated that the lot is overgrown with different types of vegetation, including poison oak. In all other respects, the property is a typical San Francisco lot zoned for certain use; and he regarded zoning to be a covenant between the City and property owners as to the type of development which will be permitted. He stated his general agreement with the intent of Environmental Impact legislation; however, he felt that application of the legislation to projects such as the one which his client proposed to construct was difficult to understand. While he, also, has a respect for trees, he did not feel that it would be proper for his neighbors to be able to tell him what he could or could not do with vegetation growing on his own property. He felt that the Director's determination that the proposed project would not have a significant Environmental Impact could be substantiated; and he requested the Commission to sustain the Director's action.

Mr. Lord stated that plans which had been submitted by the applicant indicated that a light well would be located in the approximate vicinity of the existing avocado tree; and, as a result, he felt that the trees could be preserved without necessitating major alteration of the applicant's plans.

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

President Newman stated that he was more concerned about the size of the proposed light well, particularly in view of the fact that it would deprive several dwelling units in the building to the west of the light which they presently enjoy.

Mr. Colthurst stated that the City Attorney had taken the position that developers cannot be prevented from blocking views from adjacent parcels of property.

Commissioner Porter acknowledged that aspect of the law; however, she pointed out that both buildings would benefit if the light wells in the new building were designed to coincide with the light wells of the existing building.

Mr. Gashwiler advised the Commission that the light wells would coincide to some extent; and he remarked that enlargement of his light well would result in reduction of the size of some of the units in his building.

Mr. Steele confirmed that expansion of the light well in the proposed building would reduce the number of usable bedrooms, thus resulting in a project in which 75% of the dwelling units would have only one bedroom.

Commissioner Mellon asked if it would be possible to build on the site without removing the avocado trees.

Mr. Gashwiler replied in the negative. He stated that the avocado tree has large roots which might interfere with the building's foundations; and, in addition; all of the space available on the lot will be needed to meet the City Planning Code's requirement for one off-street parking space for each dwelling unit.

Mr. Steele confirmed that it would be impossible to preserve the vegetation on the site if the building indicated on the plans which had been submitted were to be constructed. In reply to a question raised by President Newman, he stated that he suspected that it would be possible to preserve the trees if alternate plans were to be prepared.

Commissioner Mellon observed that the avocado tree would not have much exposure in any event.

Mr. Beckstead stated that two other fruit-bearing avocado trees are located within a 300-foot radius of the subject property; and he indicated that removal of one of the three existing trees would have an environmental effect.

Commissioner Porter asked if the staff was aware of any law which would make it mandatory for property owners to preserve trees. Mr. Steele replied in the negative. He indicated, however, that the adjacent property owner had sought an injunction to prevent the applicant from removing the trees until action has been taken by the Commission on the appeal.



Mr. Colthurst informed the Commission that the injunction had been ordered by Judge Ira Brown. Beyond that ruling, he had found no local or State law preventing property owners in San Francisco from cutting down trees or vegetation on their property.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that the Negative Declaration which had been filed by the Department of City Planning be affirmed by the Commission.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Rueda that the staff's Negative Declaration be affirmed. Commissioner Rueda stated that he could see that the environment of people residing in the building to the west of the subject property might be affected if the proposed building were to be constructed; however, it seemed to him that that would be the extent of the environmental impact of the building.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 7060 finding that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and affirming the Negative Declaration which had been filed by the Department of City Planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

9138

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting, held Thursday, August 23, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 23, 1973, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; William Ducheck, Planner III (Urban Design); Wilbert Hardee, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the special meeting of July 26, 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, informed the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting last Monday, had voted unanimously to lower height limits south of Lafayette Park and south of the Pacific Medical Center from 80 feet to 40 feet.

Mr. Murphy reported that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting last Tuesday, had continued its hearing on the proposal to rezone "Kite Hill" from R-3 to R-1. The committee intends to take a field trip to the site and has requested that the staff of the Department of City Planning be represented on the field trip.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioners Farrell and Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed their seats at the Commission table.

Mr. Murphy distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared which would authorize the Director to enter into and execute an agreement with URS/John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, to undertake an investigation of existing buildings and structures to provide important background data for the preparation of the seismic safety element of the Master Plan. William Ducheck, Planner III (Urban Design), summarized steps which had already been taken towards preparation and adoption of a seismic safety element of the Master Plan as required by Section 65302 of the govern-

THE [illegible] OF [illegible]

BY [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ment Code of the State of California; and he indicated that he would be prepared to respond to questions which might be raised by individual members of the Commission regarding the nature of the proposed contract.

Commissioner Porter asked if any structural studies which had been made by the consultants had been validated through actual experience. Mr. Ducheck replied that he was not aware that any structure based on studies by the consultants had been tested by an actual earthquake; however, studies made by the consultants for the Atomic Energy Commission had been checked following explosions.

Commissioner Mellon advised the Commission that the firm with which the staff proposed to contract is the most outstanding structural engineering firm in this part of the country.

President Newman asked if the consultants would analyze the building code and offer recommendations for amendment of it. Mr. Ducheck replied in the affirmative in both cases.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7061.

Mr. Murphy advised the Commission that a field trip to properties to be considered during the September 6 zoning hearing will be held at 1:00 p.m. next Thursday, August 30.

Mr. Murphy distributed copies of a draft environmental impact report on the proposed expansion of the San Francisco International Airport to members of the Commission.

President Newman announced that he had served on an advisory committee appointed by the President of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) which had recommended that BCDC suggest to the Board of Supervisors that a study be undertaken by the Department of City Planning, in conjunction with the Department of Public Works, the Metropolitan Transit Commission, and the State Division of Highways, to consider alternate methods of achieving demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway and extending Interstate 280. He indicated that the committee had also recommended that all further construction or property acquisition for the Interstate 280 extension be suspended until the study is completed.

R73.41 GRIFFITH STREET, NAVY ROAD TO OAKDALE AVENUE, ESTABLISH
 OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTH.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Griffith Street is a minor access to the southerly edge of the Hunters Point Redevelopment Project. From Palou to Oakdale Avenue its width is 34 feet, curb to curb. In the subject block the pavement width is 27 feet. Navy Road, inside the project, has just been reconstructed to a width of 36 feet. The proposal is to relocate the six-foot wide sidewalk seven feet westerly and widen the pavement

1901

Received of the Treasurer of the United States the sum of \$100.00 for the purchase of the land described in the following certificate.

That the said land is situated in the County of [illegible] State of [illegible] and is of the size of [illegible] acres, more or less, and is bounded by [illegible] on the north, [illegible] on the south, [illegible] on the east, and [illegible] on the west.

And the said land is of the value of \$100.00, and is subject to the payment of the same in installments of \$20.00 per year, for five years, commencing on the 1st day of January, 1902.

And the said land is to be sold at public auction, on the 1st day of January, 1902, at the County Court House, in the County of [illegible] State of [illegible].

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

And the said land is to be sold to the highest bidder, and the purchase money is to be paid in cash, or by check, or by draft, or by any other mode of payment, and the same is to be paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

to 34 feet, the same width as in the Palou-Oakdale block. This would result in an official sidewalk width of $12\frac{1}{2}$ feet although only six feet of this would be concrete.

"The 27-foot pavement width has been adequate because traffic is light and parking is restricted to one side. With new housing being developed on Navy Road and with the potential of demilitarization of the navy housing and shipyard to the east of Griffith Avenue the 27-foot width could become insufficient.

"The widening, financed with gas tax funds, will contribute credits to the financing of the redevelopment project. While the widening is not specified in the adopted redevelopment plan, it is indicated on the Master Site Plan, a later and more detailed design for the project which conforms to the generalized layout of the officially adopted plan."

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that establishment of the official sidewalk width of 12.15 feet on the westerly side of Griffith Street between Oakdale Avenue and Navy Road be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

No one was present in the audience to address the Commission on this matter.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the establishment of the official sidewalk width of 12.15 feet on the westerly side of Griffith Street between Oakdale Avenue and Navy Road is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R73.46 JERROLD AVENUE, MENDELL STREET TO 126 FEET EASTERLY, STREET VACATION.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"When Hunters Point war housing was constructed, Jerrold Avenue, among others was vacated east of Mendell except for this 126 foot segment, along which were several houses. The street was too steep a grade to pave and stairs provided access to the houses. The Redevelopment Agency has cleared the vicinity and wishes to replat the strip along the east side of Mendell, including the Jerrold right-of-way into a series of lots 30 feet wide. Such development is in accord with the approved Redevelopment Plan for Hunters Point.

1870

Received of the Treasurer of the County of ... the sum of ...

for the purchase of ...

Witness my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Attest my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Witness my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Attest my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Witness my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Attest my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

Witness my hand and seal this ... day of ... 1870

"The development easterly and up the hill gains its access off La Salle Avenue and Cashmere Street. A network of small parks with paths and stairs ties this area to Innes and Kirkwood Avenues, alleviating the need for a pedestrian tie on Jerrold Avenue."

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that the street vacation be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

No one was present in the audience to address the Commission on this matter.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of Jerrold Avenue from Mendell Street to 126 feet easterly is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R73.42 ACQUISITION OF LOT 6, BLOCK 3705 (NORTH WEST CORNER, 4TH AND MISSION STREETS) FOR SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Since late 1971 the Community College District has been seeking a location for a downtown education center. The Planning Commission on June 22, 1972, approved acquisition of 814 Mission Street, the former BART office building for this use. The College District found that leasing the structure and amortizing the rehabilitation costs would not be as wise a use of public funds as building new and owning its facility. Hence the District sought land and found it in Yerba Buena Center.

"The subject parcel has 75 feet of frontage on Mission Street and 130 feet on 4th Street (northwest corner) and adjoins the previously approved site. It is similarly desirable in terms of public transportation, central location for population served, and location on the periphery of the downtown retail district. Institutional uses are permitted on this site in the approved redevelopment plan for Yerba Buena Center. The plan (as well as the C-3-R zoning) calls for predominantly retail and consumer uses on the ground floor in the areas north of Mission Street and west of Third Street. The disposition agreement between the District and the Agency enforces this provision.

"The building program is still being formulated, but is envisioned as a seven or eight story structure, plus basement. It will house up to 2000 students and faculty at full capacity in standard type classrooms, with the usual ancillary facilities and retail and public oriented uses on the ground floor. The project cost will be \$5 - 6 million, financed out of this year's operating budget. Target date for occupancy is September 1975.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31st MARCH 1878

Presented to the House of Commons by Command of Her Majesty
in the Year 1878

By the Commissioner of the General Land Office,
JAMES W. L. GIBSON, Esq.

CONTENTS

STATE OF THE LANDS UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
AT THE 31st MARCH 1878

LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CROWN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE SEVERAL STATES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CHURCHES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE HOSPITALS
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH

STATE OF THE LANDS UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
AT THE 31st MARCH 1878

LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CROWN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE SEVERAL STATES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CHURCHES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE HOSPITALS
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH

STATE OF THE LANDS UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
AT THE 31st MARCH 1878

LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CROWN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE SEVERAL STATES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CHURCHES
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE HOSPITALS
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
LANDS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEITH

"The college will absorb the current programs at Alemany Adult School (750 Eddy) plus other programs now at different locations, as well as new programs paralleling principal downtown occupational fields. Other educational institutions will make part use of the facility, including ten percent of the classroom space for San Francisco State, and office space for the San Francisco Consortium."

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the estimated project cost of 5 to 6 million dollars would include the cost of the land.

George Shaw, Director of Planning for the Community College District, replied in the affirmative, indicating that the cost of the land was estimated approximately \$250,000.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the Director of Planning had recently announced that the Redevelopment Agency had agreed to allow the Department of City Planning to review plans for private buildings proposed in the Yerba Buena Center; and he asked if an architect had been selected for the proposed project. Mr. Shaw replied that the project would be designed by the architectural firm of Rockrise, Odermatt, Mountjoy, and Amis. Furthermore, since the structure will be a public building, the plans must be submitted to the Art Commission for review and approval.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the subject property measures only 75 feet by 130 feet, questioned whether it would be sufficiently large to accommodate 2,000 students. Mr. Shaw stated that the classroom space being proposed would be adequate for more than 1800 students.

President Newman asked if other facilities presently being used for adult education will be free for other uses when the proposed facility is completed. Mr. Shaw replied that the Alemany Center meets Field Act standards; and, as a result, it could continue to be used for educational purposes.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the 5th and Mission Garage, located across the street from the subject property, would be able to accommodate the automobiles owned by the 2,000 students who would be attending classes in the proposed building. Mr. Shaw replied that most of the students would come to the facility from the downtown area; and he anticipated that most of the students would either walk or that they would use public transportation.

Commissioner Porter asked if any provision would be made for recreational facilities or for open space on the site. Mr. Shaw replied that such facilities would not really be necessary since these students would not be enrolled in a comprehensive program and would attend only one or two classes a week; however, the building would have a dining facility and, possibly, a roof-top terrace.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, estimating that the proposed building would contain approximately 80,000 square feet of floor area, remarked that he could not understand how the building could cost between \$5 - 6 million dollars to construct.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the construction cost of the proposed building under such circumstances would be almost \$63 per square foot, stated that he, also, was puzzled by the figures which had been cited.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that acquisition of the property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan provided that retailing and consumer services shall be the predominant ground floor use along the street frontages as required in the Redevelopment Plan for Yerba Buena Center. He stated that that proviso had been acceptable to the Community College District.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the acquisition of Lot 6, Block 3705 for the Community College District Downtown Campus is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that "retailing and consumer services shall be the predominant ground floor use along the street frontages" as set forth in the Redevelopment Plan for Yerba Buena Center.

R73.36 HEALTH DEPARTMENT METHADONE CLINIC, ACQUISITION OF LOT 9,
BLOCK 208, 646 CLAY STREET. (FORMER MILITARY POLICE STATION).

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The Federal government has declared the old Armed Forces Police Station at 646 Clay Street (between Kearny and Montgomery) as surplus. The City has been seeking a site in the Chinatown-North Beach area for a methadone maintenance clinic, and this is the only site which is both suitable and available. The Director of Property expects to be able to acquire the property at no cost to the City.

"School District planners have expressed some interest in the site to accommodate the Chinese Education Center program when the Commodore Stockton School Annex - its current location - is reconstructed to comply with the Field Act. It is the staff's opinion that this location is inappropriate for school use, as it is in an area of businesses and non-family residence.

"The site, 54' X 109', is too small by itself for a housing project, and relocation problems prohibit combining it with adjoining properties which have hotels thereon. However, the site could be considered as having potential for housing when and if the relocation situation changes. Park or recreational use is also inappropriate inasmuch as Portsmouth Square is $\frac{1}{2}$ block west.

"This block of Clay Street has been proposed for a road widening which called for acquisition of 17 feet along the north side, including the subject parcel. While the necessity for such widening is being currently re-evaluated, City ownership of the subject parcel could contribute toward such a future project."

President Newman asked if he were correct in understanding that the property could be acquired at no cost to the City. Mr. Gamble replied that the Director of property believed that the property could be acquired without cost.

No one was present in the audience to be heard on this matter.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, recommended that acquisition of the property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the acquisition of Lot 9, Block 208 for the Health Department Methadone Program is in conformity with the Master Plan.

EE73.92 - PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE FOLLOWING PROPERTY: AREA GENERALLY BOUNDED BY OCEAN AVENUE, FAXON STREET AND KEYSTONE AND WILDWOOD WAYS BEING LOTS 5 AND 8 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3283. (HOMWOOD TERRACE). OCEAN AVENUE CONDOMINIUM, FLATS AND TOWNHOUSES WITH COMMUNITY ROOMS AND SWIMMING POOL.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), summarized the report, and described two minor modifications made to the text of the draft report by the staff of the Commission. These modifications were to include in the project description the possibility of three bedroom dwelling units described elsewhere in the original text, and to include a plan indicating the heights of the proposed dwellings.

Following Mr. Passmore's presentation, the Commission received and responded to comments made by Mr. G. L. Revell, owner of the subject property, Mr. Lee Turner, proposed project developer, Mr. Clyde Everherst, representing the OMI Community Association, Mr. Don Hesler, representing the Council of Civic Unity, and a representative of the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Passmore then recommended that the report be modified to reflect the difference in opinion concerning the degree of traffic congestion on Ocean Avenue reflected in the OMI statement in contrast to the opinion stated in the draft report, and to note on page 55 of the report that the project would not add to the stock of low income housing in the City. He stated that these modifications would be minor modifications. Mr. Murphy then recommended certification of the modified Report, and a finding that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

It was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7062 be adopted with the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby find that the final Environmental Impact Report, dated August 23, 1973, concerning 'EE73.92, Ocean Avenue Condominium Development, area

generally bounded by Ocean and Faxon Avenues and Keystone and Wildwood Ways' is adequate, accurate and objective and does hereby CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said report:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission, in certifying the completion of said report, does hereby find that the project as proposed will not have a significant effect on the environment."

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the offices of the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

ABJ

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 6, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 6, 1973, at 1:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Hector E. Rueda, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Peter Svirsky, Planner V (Zoning); Daniel Sullivan, Planner IV (Zoning); Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Katherine Bensiger, Planner II; Jay Fernandez, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Bill Boldenweck represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of August 30, 1973, be approved as submitted.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission of the recent death of James Paul, an esteemed member of the staff of the Department of City Planning. It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7063 be adopted to express the Commission's sympathy to Mr. Paul's wife and family.

The Director advised the Commission that he had recently received a \$250.00 honorarium for a speech which he had made about the City in the City; and he indicated that he felt that the money should be used for publication and distribution of the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco. He recommended that the money be accepted by the Commission for that purpose. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7064 be adopted and that the \$250.00 honorarium be accepted for use for publication and distribution of the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco.



The Director noted that two proposals relating to Pacific Heights had been referred to the Commission, namely a proposal for establishment of R-2 zoning for all properties subject to a 40-foot height limit other than those zoned R-1, C-1 or C-2, and creation of a special use district which would permit higher density in that R-2 district under certain circumstances, and stated that it was the opinion of the staff of the Department of City Planning that it would be appropriate to consider those issues in a City-wide context, especially since the concerns raised by Pacific Heights were not dissimilar from issues which had been raised in other areas of the City. The issues which he had in mind were those of scale, coverage and the size of front and rear yards, preservation of neighborhood character, parking as related to conversions, and density. He remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning is preparing a work program for a City-wide residential zoning study; and he felt that it was clear that attention would have to be focused on those issues during the course of the study. He stated that the matter had been discussed with representatives of the Pacific Heights Association and with individual members of the City Planning Commission during the past two weeks; and, as a result, it seemed to him that the two-fold approach which he was prepared to recommend would meet with a favorable reception. His first proposal was that the Commission should authorize a staff study, to be completed as quickly as possible, to determine the form and desirability of interim City-wide controls relating to the kinds of concerns which he had mentioned. The proposed interim controls would be the subject of a proposed ordinance which would go through the normal process of deliberation, with approval or rejection by the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. If the ordinance were adopted, it would remain in effect until such time as the larger City-wide residential zoning study is completed and acted upon. If the Commission wished to proceed along those lines, he suggested that it should also defer action on the Pacific Heights Association's request for R-2 zoning and for a special use district until such time as the interim controls have been proposed. He stated that he had two draft resolutions to place before the Commission following comments from representatives of the Pacific Heights Association who were present in the audience.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

John Walker, representing the Board of Directors of the Pacific Heights Association, read and submitted the following prepared statement:

"As I am sure you are aware, the Pacific Heights Association is vitally concerned about the suitability of development in the Pacific Heights area and has submitted to the Commission over the past year several applications to deal with this matter.

"At present you have before you an ordinance (#36-73-12) referred by the Board of Supervisors to establish a special use zone within the area bordered by Bush and Union, Steiner and Van Ness Avenue. We feel this proposed ordinance will accomplish the specialized controls on development to preserve our neighborhood. These controls are without the arbitrary restrictions which the Commission found in our proposal to down-zone portions of that area to R-2.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.
 The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
 and London, England, U.K.

"The ordinance, unlike an application, imposes no freeze on the development of property during the time it is being considered by the Commission. Consequently, with the present lack of controls developers will rush into projects harmful to our neighborhood.

"We request the Commission to impose a short safety freeze during the time our ordinance is being considered. This freeze can best be accomplished by passing a resolution of intent to reclassify the area (bordered by the streets referred to above) as R-2, in the 40' areas, excluding the existing R-1, C-1 and C-2.

"We feel that this period will also allow us to work with the Planning Department staff in perfecting our ordinance to serve our objectives as well as the city-wide objectives of the Commission."

Commissioner Porter, remarking that other neighborhoods had requested reclassification from R-3 to R-2, asked Mr. Walker if he would support a "freeze" for those areas similar to the one which he was proposing for Pacific Heights. Mr. Walker replied that he believed in the self-determination of neighborhoods; and he indicated that it would be difficult for him to respond to Commissioner Porter's general question in a specific way.

President Newman asked if the short-term study leading to establishment of interim controls would be acceptable to the Pacific Heights Association provided that a "freeze" were established limiting new construction in 40-foot height limit districts in Pacific Heights to R-2 density, where rezoning to that density was proposed, until the interim controls might be put into effect. Mr. Walker replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, remarking that the letter which Mr. Walker had submitted seemed to imply that the Pacific Heights Association was continuing to think in terms of a special use district especially for Pacific Heights, stated that it was his opinion that it would be much better to spend staff time on an ordinance which would have City-wide effect rather than one which would be tailored to a single neighborhood.

Mr. Walker stated that his organization would be willing to put their own ordinance aside and to work with the staff of the Department of City Planning to prepare a City-wide ordinance if the Commission would be willing to establish a "freeze" on higher density new development in 40-foot height limit districts in Pacific Heights during the interim.

Commissioner Miller noted that public hearings must be held on matters which have been referred to the Commission in ordinance form by the Board of Supervisors. The Director acknowledged that a public hearing would eventually have to be held on the proposal to rezone portions of Pacific Heights to R-2. However, the proposal generated by the Pacific Heights Association for creation of a special use district in Pacific Heights could be set aside in favor of a City-wide ordinance, provided the

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1882. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.00 per Annum.
Acceptance for Postage at Special Rate of \$3.00 per Annum authorized March 3, 1911.
Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.00 per Annum authorized March 3, 1911.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association
All rights reserved.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.
Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Supervisor who had introduced the special use district withdrew the proposal. Commissioner Ritchie, referring to the fact that the Pacific Heights Association letter had stated that developers would "rush" into projects harmful to the neighborhood if a "freeze" were not established, asked Mr. Walker if he was aware of any specific developments being contemplated in the area. Mr. Walker replied in the negative and acknowledged that the threat may have been overstated in the letter; however, if a "freeze" were instrumental in blocking a single undesirable project, he felt that it would be justified.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he believed that a 4 to 6 months "freeze" would be appropriate; and he believed that the approach which was being proposed would constitute a good compromise.

Commissioner Porter stated that the situation seemed more like blackmail than compromise to her. She felt that the type of development presently taking place in R-3 districts throughout the City is disgraceful; but she did not believe that the problem should be handled as if it affected only the Pacific Heights neighborhood. She stated that she would be willing to vote for a City-wide "freeze"; or, as an alternative, she would support a proposal to conduct discretionary reviews of any applications filed for buildings in Pacific Heights with a density greater than that which would be permitted in an R-2 district.

Commissioner Miller stated that he agreed almost completely with Commissioner Porter. He felt that it was difficult for the Commission to act under threat of ordinances sent by the Board of Supervisors, particularly when such ordinances leave the Commission in the position of having to negotiate with third parties.

The Director stated that he was not aware of an effort to seek rezoning from R-3 to R-2 in any other major area of the City; however, if such a rezoning application should be filed by a neighborhood, a "freeze" would come into effect which would prevent the staff from approving any applications for new construction in excess of R-2 density until such time as action has been taken on the rezoning application by the Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Walker if the letter which he had submitted represented the official position of a Pacific Heights Association. After he had received an affirmative response, he suggested that the Pacific Heights Association should send a further letter to the Commission stating its willingness to have the proposed special use district ordinance for Pacific Heights set aside in favor of a City-wide ordinance, if the Commission should act during the present meeting to instruct the staff to formulate interim controls to protect the character of residential neighborhoods.

Commissioner Porter stated that it was her opinion that the Commission should proceed in an orderly manner to hold hearings on the ordinances which had been transmitted by the Board of Supervisors. She did not favor placing a "freeze" on new development having a density greater than R-2 in a single given neighborhood of

the City. She stated that she had just received a letter from a group in the Sunset District asking for reclassification of certain properties from R-3 to R-2; and, if a "freeze" should be established for the Pacific Heights neighborhood, she felt that the Sunset District should be entitled to a "freeze" also.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that a great deal of discussion had taken place regarding Pacific Heights. He indicated that Mr. Walker had stated that he was not aware of any major new developments being planned for the area; and, as a result, imposition of a "freeze" as requested by the Pacific Heights Association would probably not have a serious effect. He stated that he was not prepared to make the same assumption about other neighborhoods of the City; however, if similar "freezes" were desired by other neighborhoods, they could be established in due time.

The Director then distributed and recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which contained the following resolve:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby request that the staff develop, in as short a time as possible, and present to the Commission for appropriate action, its recommendations as to the form and desirability of interim controls that might safeguard the established character of residential areas by amendments to the text of the City Planning Code, including but not necessarily limited to standards for rear yard open spaces, front setbacks and provision of off-street parking."

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how long it will be before the work program for the City-wide residential zoning study is completed by the staff. After the Director had replied that the work program will be ready in approximately one month, Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if it would be correct to assume that the recommendations being requested in the draft resolution presently under consideration would be formulated as a part of the City-wide study.

The Director replied that the interim controls which would be proposed by the staff might prove to have merit as an approach which has not been used before to meet the concerns of residential neighborhoods, and that the worth of this approach could be tested through actual practice on an interim basis.

President Newman asked if the recommendations for interim controls would be available before a hearing is scheduled on the proposal to rezone properties in 40-foot height limit districts in Pacific Heights to R-2. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the draft resolution which had been recommended by the Director was acceptable to the Pacific Heights Association. President Newman replied that it was his understanding that the proposal was acceptable to that organization.

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year.

2. The second part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

3. The third part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

7. The seventh part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

8. The eighth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

9. The ninth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

10. The tenth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7065.

The Director then distributed and recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which contained the following resolve:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby declare its intention to hold a public hearing on the proposed reclassification of property in the area bounded by Union Street, Van Ness Avenue, Bush Street and Steiner Street, as requested by the Pacific Heights Association, to impose zoning as restrictive as R-2 upon all areas subject to a zoning height limit of 40 feet and not already zoned R-1, C-1 or C-2, which declaration of intention has the effect of requiring adherence to R-2 standards in the subject areas; and the Zoning Administrator is hereby directed to set a time and place for such hearing, which time shall be not later than 5 months after the date of this resolution."

Commissioner Porter asked if adoption of the draft resolution would place a 5-month "freeze" on new development in excess of R-2 density in the Pacific Heights neighborhood. The Director replied in the affirmative but indicated that the "freeze" could last for a longer period of time if the Commission should decide not to take its action on the matter on the date when the hearing is held.

Commissioner Miller stated that he would prefer that the Commission act immediately on the rezoning proposal which had been sent by a member of the Board of Supervisors. Otherwise, the Commission would be setting a bad precedent which might be used by any individual member of the Board of Supervisors in the future to obstruct development. If the rezoning proposal had been transmitted to the Commission by a majority of the members of the Board, he would have been in favor of the "freeze"; however, since the proposal had been transmitted by a single member of the Board, he did not intend to vote for adoption of the draft resolution.

Commissioner Porter agreed with Commissioner Miller and stated that she felt that a clear-cut decision on the zoning matter should be rendered by the Commission as soon as possible. She believed that the procedure being proposed in the draft resolution could end up in a compromise which would be satisfactory to no one.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that adoption of the draft resolution would have no effect whatsoever on building applications which had been filed previously; and, in view of the current tight-money market, he doubted that many permits for major new construction in the area will be filed during the next 5 or 6 months.

President Newman stated that it was his opinion that what was being proposed was not a compromise but an honest effort to work out a major difference of opinion between the staff and the neighborhood as to the proper zoning pattern for Pacific Heights. He felt that the proposed "freeze" would be in order insofar as it would provide an opportunity for the parties concerned to study the problem in a sensible fashion.

THE FIRST PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1624 TO 1789.

THE SECOND PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1789 TO 1898.

THE THIRD PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1898 TO 1900.

THE FOURTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1900 TO 1901.

THE FIFTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1901 TO 1902.

THE SIXTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1902 TO 1903.

THE SEVENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1903 TO 1904.

THE EIGHTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1904 TO 1905.

THE NINTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1905 TO 1906.

THE TENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1906 TO 1907.

THE ELEVENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1907 TO 1908.

THE TWELFTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1908 TO 1909.

THE THIRTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1909 TO 1910.

THE FOURTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK FROM 1910 TO 1911.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not feel that it would be proper for the Commission to establish a City-wide "freeze" as suggested by Commissioner Porter. However, if such a "freeze" should be desired by other neighborhoods, they could file applications requesting reclassification to R-2; and, under those circumstances, he felt that it would be appropriate for the Commission to delay hearing of those applications until approximately the same time as the Pacific Heights rezoning matter is to be heard.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he regarded both of the draft resolutions which had been presented by the Director as being interrelated; and, since the Pacific Heights Association had requested the "freeze" being recommended by the Director, he did not feel that it would be improper for the Commission to grant their request.

Commissioner Farrell stated that he was in favor of the "freeze" being proposed; however, he was concerned about the fact that action was being taken under the agenda item "Current Matters" and that it had not been carried as a separate item on the agenda. While the Pacific Heights Association was represented, he felt that there might be individuals who would be opposed to the proposal who would have wanted to be present, also.

The Director stated that the first draft resolution calling for development of interim controls would have no immediate effect except that it would put the entire community on notice that new controls are being contemplated. The second resolution, through which the Commission would declare its intention to consider the proposal for rezoning in Pacific Heights, would have no different effect than if the Pacific Heights Association were to file a new application requesting the rezoning.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the draft resolution be adopted. When the question was called, the Commission voted 4 to 2 to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7066. Commissioners Farrell, Fleishhacker, Newman, and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioners Miller and Porter voted "No."

ZM73.22 - 334-336 CLAREMONT STREET, WEST LINE, 100 FEET SOUTH OF ULLOA STREET.
R-1-D TO A C-2 DISTRICT.

(UNDER ADVISEMENT from meetings of July 5 and August 2, 1973)

George Choppelas, attorney for the applicant, remarked that this matter had been taken under advisement by the Commission to permit him to write to the City Attorney regarding the feasibility of a restrictive covenant which would assure that his client's property would be used for no commercial activity other than the one which presently exists on the ground floor even if the property were to be rezoned from R-1-D to C-2. He stated that he had just received a letter of reply from the City Attorney earlier in the day; and, since he had not yet had an opportunity to study that response, he requested that the matter be continued under advisement for one week.

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and interesting in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of life, and shows that the most probable one is the theory of spontaneous generation.

The second part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of spontaneous generation. It is shown that this theory is based on the fact that life is a complex phenomenon, and that it is not possible to explain the origin of life by the action of a single cause.

The third part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the various experiments which have been conducted in order to test the theory of spontaneous generation. It is shown that the results of these experiments are in favor of the theory, and that the theory is therefore well founded.

The fourth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the various objections which have been raised against the theory of spontaneous generation. It is shown that these objections are not valid, and that the theory is therefore well founded.

The fifth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the various applications of the theory of spontaneous generation. It is shown that the theory has many important applications, and that it is therefore of great value to science.

The sixth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the various conclusions which can be drawn from the theory of spontaneous generation. It is shown that the theory leads to many important conclusions, and that it is therefore of great value to science.

The seventh part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the various questions which remain to be solved. It is shown that there are many important questions which remain to be solved, and that it is therefore necessary to continue the study of the theory of spontaneous generation.

President Newman asked if any member of the audience had an objection to holding this matter over for one week and received no response.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that this matter be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on September 13, 1973.

CU73.23 - MISSION STREET, SOUTH LINE, 61.77 FEET WEST OF MAIN STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT FOR 83 CARS IN
A C-3-0 AND A C-3-S DISTRICT.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is triangular parcel with 219 feet of frontage on Mission Street and 30 feet of frontage on Howard Street for a total area of 68,898 square feet. The northerly portion of the property is zoned C-3-0; and the southerly portion of the property is zoned C-3-S. The property is presently used for railroad team tracks and parking. The applicant, The Southern Pacific Land Company, had filed the subject application to legalize use of the property for temporary parking of 83 automobiles.

Gregg Nicholson, representing The Southern Pacific Land Company, stated that the automobiles which are being parked on the subject property were previously parked behind the Southern Pacific Building. He stated that most of the cars are owned by the company rather than by employees of the company.

President Newman inquired about Southern Pacific's long-term plans for the subject property. Mr. Nicholson replied that The Southern Pacific Land Company had entered a long-term lease with developers who planned to construct a high-rise building on the property within the next few years.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Condition No. 2 of the draft resolution specified that use of the parking lot should be limited to employees of The Southern Pacific Land Company, suggested that it might be desirable to change the language to indicate that the parking lot should be used only by Southern Pacific and its subsidiaries.

Mr. Nicholson requested that Condition No. 2 of the draft resolution be changed as suggested by Commissioner Fleishhacker. The Director agreed to the change.

President Newman asked if the remaining conditions which had been recommended by the Director would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Nicholson replied that he was concerned about the requirement for landscaping as specified in Condition No. 3 of the draft resolution. He emphasized that the property would be used as a parking lot only on an interim basis. Under the circumstances, the amount of landscaping to be installed would probably depend upon the amount of money which would be involved. He was also concerned that installation of landscaping on the corners might bring objections from the State Highway Department.

The Director stated that the landscaping which would be required by Condition No. 3 of the draft resolution had been indicated in the applicant's submittal; and he stated that the landscaping proposed was acceptable to the State Division of Highways.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, as modified, be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7076 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by the Director, as amended.

CU73.33 - 1629 PINE STREET, SOUTH EAST CORNER OF FRANKLIN STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR AN EXTERIOR CAR WASH WITH
GASOLINE PUMPING FACILITIES; IN A C-2 DISTRICT AND PARTLY
IN AN AUTOMOTIVE SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular parcel with 200 feet of frontage on Pine and Austin Streets and 120 feet of frontage on Franklin Street for a total area of 24,000 square feet. He stated that the property is presently occupied by a gasoline service station and other automobile related uses; and he indicated that the applicant proposed to construct a car wash with gasoline pumping facilities on the site.

Herbert McLaughlin, the applicant, described a site plan of the project, emphasizing that the car wash itself would be located below grade. He also described the traffic pattern proposed for the site. While he acknowledged that both Pine and Franklin Streets carry heavy traffic, he did not feel that the proposed facility would significantly increase traffic in the area.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the subject property has a slight slope, asked if it was the slope which would make it economically feasible to place the car wash underground. Mr. McLaughlin replied that the slope certainly made it more economical to place the car wash underground; however, he believed that car washes could be placed underground on flat lots, also.

Commissioner Ritchie then asked if all of the noise-making equipment in the car wash would be located underground. Mr. McLaughlin replied in the affirmative but indicated that some noise might escape from the exit of the car wash.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative document. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the situation. It is a very detailed and thorough document. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations. It is a very clear and concise document.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative document. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the situation. It is a very detailed and thorough document. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations. It is a very clear and concise document.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative document. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the situation. It is a very detailed and thorough document. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations. It is a very clear and concise document.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative document. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the situation. It is a very detailed and thorough document. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations. It is a very clear and concise document.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative document. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the situation. It is a very detailed and thorough document. The third part of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations. It is a very clear and concise document.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was very impressed with the plans which had been displayed. However, it appeared that the proposed project might be tremendously expensive; and she wondered if there was a chance that the applicant might return to the Commission in a few months to request simplification of the plans.

Mr. McLaughlin replied that he is a co-owner of the subject property; and he indicated that he did not anticipate any financial difficulty with the proposed facility. He advised the Commission that the buildings which presently occupy the site have partial basements; and, as a result, the extra cost of locating the car wash underground would not be major. Other special features being proposed such as the pool, a skylight in the car wash, and some retaining walls would not be especially expensive, particularly in view of the volume of business which is anticipated.

Commissioner Fleishhacker expressed concern about the possibility that cars entering or leaving the proposed car wash might interfere with traffic on Pine Street; and he asked if it would be possible to change the traffic pattern on the site if accidents should, in fact, occur. Mr. McLaughlin replied that it would be possible to require all of the traffic to leave the site by way of Austin and Franklin Streets, prohibiting exits onto Pine Street. He pointed out, however, that the site has 5 entrances and exits on the 2 major street frontages at the present time.

Commissioner Miller remarked that the renderings of the proposed facility indicated that it would look more like a mini-park than a car wash; and he wondered if large signs would have to be installed to advertise the fact it would actually be a car wash. Mr. McLaughlin replied that he was proposing to install 2 slab signs and a monument on the site.

Commissioner Farrell asked if the car wash would have attendants to clean the inside of the automobiles being serviced. Mr. McLaughlin replied in the negative, indicating that the car wash will be entirely automatic and will clean only the outside of the automobiles.

Philip Deovlet, owner of property at 1660 Pine Street, agreed that the rendering of the proposed project was most attractive; and, since customers of the car wash would see his furniture store while stopped on the subject property, he felt that it was possible that the car wash might improve his business. However, in view of the heavy traffic burden already carried by Pine and Franklin Streets, he did not feel that another traffic hazard at the intersection would be warranted. He also remarked that a portion of the present gas station site is used for off-street parking; and removal of those cars onto the streets would increase parking congestion in the area. In conclusion, he suggested that car washes should be on streets which carry less traffic than Pine and Franklin Streets.

Chester Wossack, operator of the service station which has existed on the site for the past 20 years, agreed with Mr. Deovlet that the proposed facility would create a traffic hazard; and, in view of the current gasoline shortage, he could see no need for a larger service station on the site.

Richard Lewis, owner of the Aetna Hotel at 1617 Pine Street, pointed out that his property abuts the subject lot on the east. In reply to a question raised by Commissioner Ritchie, he indicated that his building has an auto-top shop on the ground floor with lodgings for 42 people above. He stated that several of his tenants own automobiles which are essential to their work; and he remarked that construction of the proposed facility would take away some of the off-street parking presently available in the area. He also emphasized that Austin Street is really a very narrow alley; and he advised the Commission that it is practically impossible to get out of Austin Street onto Franklin Street after 3:30 p.m. because of the volume of traffic on Franklin Street during the evening rush hour. He remarked that the City had spent several million dollars a few years ago to widen Pine Street so that it could carry more traffic more efficiently; and, if the proposed project were to be constructed, he felt that it would negate the value of the street widening project.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that it seemed to him that the proposed project would make the building owned by Mr. Lewis more prominent and would enhance the building with its trees, fountain, and landscaping. Mr. Lewis replied that he has no difficulty keeping his hotel fully occupied; and he stated that he was not interested in soliciting tenants from the street. His main concern was directed at keeping his present tenants happy. He informed the Commission that there have been 52 accidents involving 3 fatalities at the intersection of Franklin and Pine Streets during the past 3 years.

Commissioner Ritchie pointed out that a service station occupies the subject site at the present time. Mr. Lewis responded that the proposed car wash would generate more traffic than the existing service station.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that traffic access to and from the site had been carefully planned by the applicant. Mr. Lewis replied that vehicles would have to pass over sidewalks which are used by pedestrians. He indicated that the service station presently occupying the site services only 2 or 3 cars an hour; however, he anticipated that the flow of traffic on and off the site would be constant if the car wash were to be constructed.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he continued to feel that the proposed project would enhance Mr. Lewis' building, particularly if that building has a lightwell on its west wall. Mr. Lewis agreed that the rendering of the proposed project was attractive; however, when the project is actually constructed, it could be a "Mickey Mouse" sort of thing.

President Newman asked if the car wash would be operated at night. Mr. McLaughlin replied that the proposed hours of operation would be from 7:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m.; and, in any case, since the car wash would be located, the amount of noise dissipated into the neighborhood would be minimal. He believed that the traffic plan which he was proposing would constitute an improvement over present circumstances on the property; and he emphasized that he had given particular attention to the northwest corner of the site to insure that traffic on Pine and Franklin Streets would have good visibility over that portion of the property.

Mr. Deovlet asked if there were a chance that automobiles waiting to be serviced by the car wash would back up into either Pine or Franklin Street. Mr. McLaughlin replied that he was confident that the back-up capacity which would be provided on the site would be adequate to insure that there would be no interference with traffic on the two adjacent streets. He also noted that parking is still permitted on the east side of Franklin Street; and, as a result, traffic on that street must not be heavy enough to require use of the full street width for moving traffic.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, distributed copies of a draft resolution of approval with 6 specific conditions which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. He then summarized the conditions; and, noting that the conditions did not establish hours of operation for the facility, he suggested that the Commission might wish to add a condition specifying that the hours of operation would be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he was concerned about the traffic problems which the proposed facility might create. He felt that it might be particularly difficult to get onto Franklin Street from Austin Street; and, as a result, he suggested that it might be desirable to change Austin Street from one-way west-bound to one-way east-bound so that traffic exiting from the car wash would be funneled onto Van Ness Avenue rather than onto Franklin Street.

The Director stated that members of the Department of City Planning had tried the proposed access route from Austin Street onto Franklin Street and had found that it worked.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the traffic signals on Franklin Street are synchronized; and, as a result, cars can move from Austin Street onto Franklin Street between signals without interfering with the traffic flow.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by the Director would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. McLaughlin replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7068 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by the Director.

CU73.37 MISSION STREET, NORTH LINE, 100 FEET EAST OF 9TH STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A PARKING LOT FOR 58 AUTOMOBILES;
IN A C-3-G DISTRICT.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular lot with a 92-foot frontage on Mission Street and 143-foot frontage on Laskie Street for a total area of 13,190 square feet. The property is presently vacant; and the applicant proposed to use

the site as a parking lot for 58 cars. He concluded his presentation by pointing out that the case report which had been prepared on the subject application contained the following important information regarding traffic and transit information on Mission Street:

- "1. According to the Transportation Element of the Master Plan for San Francisco, Mission Street is a Transit Preferential Street and as such is inappropriate for access to automobile parking facilities.
- "2. Mission Street is one of the principal streets under the Muni Transit Improvement Program which seeks to optimize conditions for most efficient transit service of all lines using Mission Street.
- "3. The Market Street Beautification Program, which calls for the removal of all electric trolley buses off Market, will result in the addition of all those trolley lines to those already operating on Mission Street. The composite effect of the Muni Transit Improvement Program and this program is that the number of buses on Mission Street within the next three years will double. The headways between buses, as calculated by the Department of Public Works, will be only ten seconds.
- "4. The Howard/Folsom one-way couple planned by the Department of Public Works, Department of City Planning, and the Chamber of Commerce and implemented two years ago was designed with the idea of routing all through automobile traffic off Market and Mission Streets and onto Howard and Folsom.
- "5. The Transit First Policy of the Board of Supervisors calls for the immediate implementation of a Transit Preferential Streets Program. In November the program designed by representatives of Muni, Department of Public Works, and Department of City Planning will be presented to the Supervisors. Mission Street is included as one of the first streets to receive transit preferential treatment.
- "6. Finally, the subject property has the potential of alternative access. One possibility is for the applicant to arrange with the owner of the adjacent parking lot for access from Ninth Street. If this were arranged, then the lot could be screened and used for parking without having any adverse effect on efforts to implement the transit first policy of the Board of Supervisors on this major transit preferential street."

Peter Chernik, attorney for the applicant, stated that his client had asked him to appear on this matter earlier in the day; and he indicated that he was not prepared to speak to the issues involved.

Published weekly, except on Sundays, and on the last day of the month. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

The Journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for libraries and institutions is \$10.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for foreign countries is \$12.00 per annum in advance. The subscription price for the year 1900 is \$5.00 in advance.

Mrs. Johanna Bailey, 36 Laskie Street, stated that she had written to the Zoning Administrator indicating that she would not object to use of the subject property for a parking lot providing that the entrance to the parking lot is located on Mission Street and not on Laskie Street, which is a narrow street which provides access to loading bays and emergency exits. At the present time, it is difficult for fire engines to get into Laskie Street; and she felt that creation of an entrance to the proposed parking lot on Laskie Street would constitute health, fire, and safety hazards. She also feared that the additional traffic on the street might cause tenants to move from her building.

The Secretary called attention to four letters which had been received from people who live or work in the area, all of which took the position that the proposed parking lot should not be allowed to have an entrance on Laskie Street.

President Newman remarked that the transit policies which Mr. Passmore had recited earlier would preclude the parking lot from having an entrance from Mission Street. However, he noted that the subject property lies adjacent to another parking lot which has an entrance from 9th Street; and he wondered if any effort had been made to reach an agreement whereby access to the subject property could be obtained across that parking lot.

Mrs. Bailey stated that the parking lot to the north of the subject property has been merged with a larger parking lot which fronts on Market Street; and she indicated that she had been advised that a new building may be constructed on that property in approximately one year.

Louise Bailey, 36 Laskie Street, emphasized that it is important to keep Laskie Street clear of traffic in case an emergency should arise.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He remarked that the proposed parking lot would depend on access from Mission Street, which has been designated in the Master Plan as a transit preferential street; and, as a transit preferential street, access to automobile parking facilities from Mission Street would be inappropriate. He stated that the Department of Public Works had calculated a 45 second headway between buses using Mission Street; and he remarked that the proposed parking lot would conflict with that headway schedule which would be necessary to allow removal of electric trolley buses from Market Street under the beautification program for that street. He stated that the applicant had not demonstrated sufficient need for additional parking in the Civic Center area to compensate for the serious conflict with public transit which would be created by the proposed lot; and, for those reasons, he felt that the application should be disapproved. Furthermore, while he acknowledged that there are a number of parking lots in the vicinity of the subject site, he indicated that any future proposals for parking lots which might interfere with the transit preferential nature of Mission Street will have to be looked at closely.

THE HISTORY OF

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENTS TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY J. W. FULTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. W. FULTON, 1850.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7069 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU73.38 1444-48 CHURCH STREET, NORTH WEST CORNER OF ARMY STREET.
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR A NURSERY SCHOOL FOR 15
PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN, IN AN R-3 DISTRICT.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has a 60-foot frontage on Church Street and an 80-foot frontage on Army Street and a total area of 4,840 square feet. He stated that the property is occupied by a building which houses a vacant non-conforming use store on the ground floor and 3 dwelling units above. The applicant had requested permission to use the lower level of the building and an adjacent vacant lot as a nursery school and play yard.

Deidre Walsh, the applicant, stated that she hoped that the application would be approved by the Commission.

President Newman asked the applicant if she felt that the proposed facility is needed in the subject neighborhood. Miss Walsh replied in the affirmative.

Kirby Ortiz De Montellano stated that she has a two-year old daughter who would attend the proposed nursery school. She also advised the Commission that the applicant's proposal had been discussed by both the Planning and the Education Committees of the Eureka Valley Promotion Association; and they had taken a position in favor of the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Passmore stated that the Director recommended that the application be approved subject to 4 conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which had been prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the proposed nursery school would be licensed. Miss Walsh replied in the affirmative. She then expressed concern about Condition No. 2 of the draft resolution which had been placed before the Commission by Mr. Passmore. She remarked that that condition would limit the number of children to be cared for on the site to 15; and, in view of the fact that she would have 3 people on her staff she felt that she would need to care for more than 15 children in order to make ends meet.

Mr. Passmore remarked that the application which had been filed with the Department had specified that a maximum of 15 children would be cared for on the site. The limitation established by the City Planning Code is 1 child for every 100 square feet of outdoor play area; and, in view of the fact that 2200 square feet of play area is available on the subject site, a maximum of 22 children could be permitted.

Miss Walsh indicated that she would be satisfied with a limitation of 22 children. When asked by President Newman if the other conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Passmore were satisfactory, she replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be amended to specify that a maximum of 22 children could be cared for on the site and that the modified draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7070. Subsequently, however, it was determined by the staff that the Commission was not authorized to approve the application for more than 15 children since the advertisement of the hearing had specified that the applicant was requesting permission to care for a maximum of 15 children on the site. The applicant was advised of the situation.

7M73.26 199 BRANNAN STREET, PROPERTY BOUNDED BY BRANNAN, FIRST AND
FREMONT STREETS AND THE SOUTHERN EMBARCADERO FREEWAY.
M-2 TO A C-M DISTRICT.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has frontages of 234 feet along Fremont Street, 275 feet along Brannan Street, 477 feet along First Street, and 367 feet along the Embarcadero for a total area of 101,833 square feet. The property is presently occupied by railroad team tracks, a small factory and a janitorial supply warehouse and office. The applicant had requested that the property be reclassified to C-M so that it could be used as an overnight parking lot for recreational vehicles.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the lot would be used only for storage of recreational vehicles or if people would actually live on the site overnight. Mr. Passmore replied that tourists traveling in recreational vehicles would probably reside on the site during their stay in San Francisco.

Commissioner Ritchie, pointing out that the subject property is not adjacent to a C-M district, remarked that approval of the application would be a classic case of "spot zoning." Furthermore, he felt that the proposed use would be inappropriate insofar as no one else lives in that area of the City.

John E. Kenny, Jr., the applicant, stated that he proposed to lease the subject property from the Port of San Francisco for conversion to an overnight parking lot for recreational vehicles. He noted that it is illegal for recreational vehicles to park on the City's streets at night; and he believed that the facility which he proposed to develop would provide a needed service for tourists. He stated that the property has reasonably easy access from the freeway system; and he indicated that he would pave and fence the property and put in water, sewer, and electrical hookups. He also intended to landscape the site.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the length of time tourists might spend at the proposed recreational vehicle park. Mr. Kenny replied that most tourists would probably not remain for longer than 2 or 3 days or 8 days at the maximum. After Commissioner Ritchie had remarked that he felt that the subject property would be a miserable place for people to stay overnight, Mr. Kenny remarked that there are not many large flat parcels of property available which would be suitable for the proposed use; and he emphasized that the proposed project would have some redeeming factors. The property is located on a bus line, operation of the park would be maintained on a 24-hour basis, and security guards would be hired. He also remarked that there is a need for the type of facility being proposed. Hotel rooms in the Fisherman's Wharf area cost at least \$22.00 a night; and often people traveling in campers or motor homes cannot afford such an expense.

Commissioner Ritchie asked where the Embarcadero Freeway extension would be located with respect to the subject property. Mr. Kenny replied that the freeway would be constructed over the property and would reduce the number of parking spaces from 100 to approximately 53 during the construction process. However, the freeway is not scheduled to be constructed until 1975; and, after completion of the freeway, some of the parking spaces might be regained. In any case, the freeway would probably not carry a great deal of night-time traffic; and, as a result, it would not interfere with the proposed use. He stated that he had requested a 5-year use permit from the Port Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked where tourists park their campers and motor homes at the present time. Mr. Kenny replied that San Anselmo in Marin County has a number of parks for campers and motor homes. Northern San Mateo County, however, has only one or two facilities of that sort with a total of not more than 14 parking spaces.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the 5-year lease with the Port Commission would contain an option for renewal. Mr. Kenny replied that there would be no option for renewal; and he indicated that he would pay a flat rental fee based on the value of the land.

President Newman, remarking that the Commission had previously approved a similar facility which had never been constructed, asked if motor home parks are economically sound ventures. Mr. Kenny replied that the lot which had previously been authorized by the Commission had had an area of only 28,000 square feet which may have been too small to accommodate an economically viable project. That developer had intended to operate the motor home parks in conjunction with an adjacent hotel; however, since the motel had never been built, the motor home parks project had been abandoned.

Jim Thieman, Assistant Property Manager for the Port of San Francisco, stated that they have had a problem with campers parking along the Embarcadero at night; and the police had been unwilling to ask them to move because they did not know where they would go.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that the fact that there is nowhere for them to go at the present time should not be used as a justification for putting them in the wrong location.

Mr. Thieman pointed out that the applicant had indicated that he would hire security guards; and, since people parking in the area at the present time have no protection, the proposed project would bring a partial solution to the problem.

President Newman asked what recommendation had been made for use of the subject property in the Northern Waterfront Plan. Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, replied that the property had been designated for a Port-oriented use in that plan.

Philip Sussman, owner of property located across the street from the subject site, stated that several companies employing a number of people are located in the area; and he did not feel that the proposed project would help to upgrade the neighborhood. He also advised the Commission that he is making plans for development of his property; and he felt that the subject property should be used for industrial purposes.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if there is a considerable amount of truck traffic in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Sussman replied in the affirmative, indicating that the area is subject to heavy truck traffic 24 hours a day.

The Director remarked that the proposed reclassification would give special benefit to a single property owner, thus resulting in "spot zoning" of doubtful legality. He also noted that the proposed use would be basically residential in nature; yet, residential support services are not immediately available in the subject neighborhood. Furthermore, surrounding industrial uses would not be compatible with a residential use. He stated that the applicant had not demonstrated a clear public need for, nor benefit to be gained from, the proposed facility. For these reasons, he recommended that the application be disapproved.

It was moved by Commissioner Ritchie and seconded by Commissioner Farrell that the application be disapproved.

Mr. Kenny suggested that it might be helpful if he were to be given an opportunity to confer with Mr. Sussman to familiarize him with the type of development which was being planned for the property.

The Director stated that his recommendation would have been for disapproval of the application even if Mr. Sussman had not appeared to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Kenny then stated that tourism is a big business in San Francisco; and he felt that it was unfortunate that the Master Plan of the City does not provide for the type of facility which he proposed to develop to serve tourists. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been able to offer no suggestions

The first of these is the fact that the...

The second is the fact that the...

The third is the fact that the...

The fourth is the fact that the...

The fifth is the fact that the...

The sixth is the fact that the...

The seventh is the fact that the...

The eighth is the fact that the...

The ninth is the fact that the...

The tenth is the fact that the...

The eleventh is the fact that the...

The twelfth is the fact that the...

The thirteenth is the fact that the...

for an alternate site for the proposed development; and, as a result of discussion with the staff, he presumed that the only course which he could follow would be to seek an amendment of the text of the City Planning Code to allow motor home parks in a wider range of zoning districts. He stated that he did not really feel that the subject property would be a bad location for the proposed development; and he indicated that he would have been willing to conform to any conditions which the Commission might have wished to establish.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if there was anything that the staff could do to accommodate Mr. Kenny in his effort to establish a motor home park in San Francisco. The Director replied that the only alternatives would be to establish a special use district, to find a proper location in some other C-M zoning district, to amend the City Planning Code to allow such a development as a principle permitted use in other zoning districts, or to handle the matter as a planned unit development if a sufficiently large parcel of property were involved.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 7071 and to disapprove the subject application.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
CHICAGO, ILL.
DEAR SIR:
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst. in relation to the proposed publication of the "History of the United States" by the University of Chicago Press. I am very glad to hear that you are interested in the project, and I am sure that the University will be pleased to have you as an author.

I have discussed the matter with the Faculty of the University, and they have agreed to publish the work. I am sure that the work will be of great value to the students of the University, and I am sure that you will be pleased to have the work published by the University Press. I am sure that the work will be of great value to the students of the University, and I am sure that you will be pleased to have the work published by the University Press.

I am sure that the work will be of great value to the students of the University, and I am sure that you will be pleased to have the work published by the University Press. I am sure that the work will be of great value to the students of the University, and I am sure that you will be pleased to have the work published by the University Press.

Very respectfully,
J. H. P.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
CHICAGO, ILL.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 13, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 13, 1973, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice-President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, President.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning); Lucian Blazej, City Planning Coordinator; Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); William Duchek, Planner III (Urban Design); Sidney Shaw, Planner III; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of August 2 and 9, 1973, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, informed the Commission that the Secretary of the State Resources Agency has issued proposed amendments to the State guidelines for Environmental Impact Review and will hold hearings in October on the proposed changes.

The Director advised the Commission that a referral had been made by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to various City Departments concerning the Junior Chamber of Commerce proposal for a new cable car line on Grant Avenue. However, after a meeting of the Transportation Policy Group, the matter was discussed with the Clerk of the Board and it was agreed that consideration of such a proposal at this time would be premature. Therefore, the matter will be tabled indefinitely.

Commissioner Porter remarked that it seemed to her that the proposal for construction of a new cable car line on Grant Avenue was an irresponsible suggestion, given the narrowness of that street.

Commissioner Fleishhacker agreed with Commissioner Porter and remarked that it would be a waste of money to spend as much as 5 cents to study the proposal.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Commissioner Rueda stated that Grant Avenue would be the last place in the world he would propose to put a new cable car line.

After further discussion, the Commissioners requested that the record show that they were of the opinion that construction of a new cable car line on a street as narrow as Grant Avenue would be most inappropriate.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT NO. 425794 FOR ALTERATION OF
BUILDING LOCATED AT 336-338 CUMBERLAND STREET.
(UNDER ADVISEMENT for meeting of August 16, 1973)

The Secretary stated that the main subject discussed during the meeting of August 16 was the request of the attorney for the applicant for postponement of the matter until today's meeting. While various facts relating to the case had arisen during the discussion, no formal presentation was made by the staff of the Department of City Planning. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Commission had voted to take the matter under advisement and had specified that all construction work on the site should cease during the interim except that work which, in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator and the Bureau of Building Inspection, would be necessary for the safety of adjacent property. The Commission had also requested that plans be available by September 13 with sufficient detail to clarify the actual intentions of the applicant.

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), stated that an application had been approved on August 17 to permit the applicant to proceed with work considered to be essential for safety. Subsequently, the applicant had filed a new application to cover the remainder of the work which he wished to do on the property; and it was that new application which was now being considered by the Commission. He also indicated that plans had been submitted which, while lacking structural detailing, were sufficient for the purpose of the Commission's review. Mr. Passmore then proceeded with his presentation, as follows:

"The subject-dwelling, which was legalized in 1965 as a two-family dwelling in an R-1 zoning district, contains two floors of living area, having a total area of approximately 1,470 square feet. The dwelling has been under a long-standing Bureau of Building Inspection Condemnation Order due to Building Code violations. The present owner purchased the property after the issuance of the Condemnation Report. The proposed alterations would, in addition to correcting Building Code violations, add a potential third floor of occupancy to this dwelling by increasing the floor area and ceiling height of the existing small basement area sufficiently to qualify as a living area under the Building Code. This new floor level, having a floor area of approximately 540 square feet, having a ceiling height of 8 feet and approximately 360 square feet having a ceiling height of 7.5 feet, would not be directly connected to either of the existing dwelling units, although the stairway leading to the level

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Paid for postage by the American Medical Association.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association

Second-Class Postage Paid at Chicago, Ill.
Postmaster: This publication is entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1917, under special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. It is published weekly, except on Sundays and public holidays. It is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Paid for postage by the American Medical Association.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Paid for postage by the American Medical Association.

would be off of the hallway to the lower and smaller of the two existing dwelling units. Additionally, the proposed alterations would add decks at the rear of the dwelling at both existing floor levels. The rear wall of the lower dwelling unit, presently overhung by the upper dwelling unit, would be extended to the same wall line as the upper unit to meet Building Code window exposure requirements. No off-street parking is presently provided for this dwelling, and none is proposed by the subject application.

"The subject dwelling is on the north side and approximately at the middle of the 300 block of Cumberland Street, and is at the northern edge of the Dolores Heights R-1 zoned area.

"The 300 block of Cumberland Street is accessible by vehicles only from the south along Sanchez Street.

"The background report given to the Commission reviewed the history of building permit applications for the subject dwelling filed by applicant.

"These permits included a permit denied on November 16, 1967, by the Planning Commission under its discretionary powers. This application added a third floor to the top of the dwelling and extending the dwelling 24 feet to the rear. At that time the Commission stated that the substandard second dwelling unit (the lower dwelling unit) should be eliminated entirely if the owner of the property wished to enlarge the main dwelling unit of the building. This denial was concurred with by the Board of Permit Appeals.

"In 1968 and 1969 several applications for minor alterations were filed.

"In December, 1971, a building permit was issued Mr. Moore to correct Building Code violations, and to add the same decks to the rear of the dwelling and extension of the rear wall of the lower dwelling unit shown under the present application.

"In 1972, Mr. Moore filed Application No. 409726 to 'move partition, correct foundation and build concrete retaining wall.' This application was approved by the City. Work resulting from this application commenced in June, 1973, at which time nearby neighbors contacted this Department as they believed the work being done exceeded that authorized under the permit issued in 1971. Subsequently the Bureau of Building Inspection discovered that the work also exceeded that authorized under the 1972 permit. As a result all work was halted by the Bureau of Building Inspection except that required to provide for the safety of the subject dwelling and adjacent dwellings. The present application and discretionary review by the Commission concerns the additional work.

"City Planning Code Provisions"

"Under the terms of the Planning Code this two-family dwelling is a non-conforming use subject to the provisions of Sections 151 through 156 of the Code. Section 151 reads 'No building, the use of which is non-conforming wholly or in substantial part, shall be structurally altered, unless the alteration is required by law, or will have the effect of and actually result in eliminating the non-conforming use, or unless the aggregate total cost of all such alterations, as estimated by the Department of Public Works, is less than one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the assessed valuation of the improvements prior to the first such alteration.'"

During the course of Mr. Passmore's presentation, Commissioners Miller and Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed their seats at the Commission table.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Passmore has stated that Section 151 of the City Planning Code provides that no non-conforming dwelling shall be structurally altered unless the cost of such alterations is less than one-half of the assessed valuation of the improvements prior to the first such alteration, indicated that the limit could also be expressed as one eighth of the actual cash value of the building.

Mr. Passmore stated that the assessed value of the building in 1968, the date of the first structural alteration to the building under the terms of Section 151, was \$2,250.00; and he indicated that it was believed that the cost of the deck which had been constructed at the rear of the building as a result of a building application approved in 1971 was equal to approximately one-half of the assessed value of the building. Much of the remainder of the work proposed was required to bring the building up to Building Code standards; and, as a result, that work would be exempted from the limitations of Section 151 of the City Planning Code.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the subject building permit application be disapproved unless the plans filed with the application are modified so as to provide 1.) that no portion of the basement have a ceiling height greater than 7 feet and 2.) that no portion of the basement extend beyond the present exterior walls of the first floor of the subject dwelling. The Director further recommended that the modified plans should not be approved by the Zoning Administrator unless they are accompanied by the placing on the land records in the County Recorder's Office of a notice of special restrictions approved by the Zoning Administrator, restricting the use of the resulting basement area to solely an accessory area for the existing lower dwelling unit in the subject building, with such basement not to be used for living accommodations of any nature, or income-producing purposes.

G. David Horn, attorney for the applicant, distributed copies of plans which had been prepared to show the work which his client intended to undertake. He also displayed a picture of the building which occupies the subject property and advised the Commission that he had obtained an affidavit from the Assessor's Office verifying that the building has been occupied by 2 dwelling units at least since 1943.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

[Faint, illegible text block]

[Faint, illegible text block]

[Faint, illegible text block]

[Faint, illegible text block]

[Faint, illegible text block]

[Faint, illegible text block]

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Horn if he had any objection to the recommendation which had been made by the Director of Planning.

Mr. Horn replied that he objected to the proposal that the ceiling height in the basement should be limited to 7 feet since his client wished to have an 8-foot ceiling. He also objected to the Director's proposal that the basement should not be extended beyond the present exterior walls of the first floor of the building. He remarked that the plans which he had distributed show clearly that his client intended to use the basement area as a workshop; and he pointed out that the plans indicated that the basement area would not be intended for habitable use. He emphasized that much of the area beneath the building would remain unexcavated; and, as a result, expansion beyond the present exterior walls of the first floor of the building was being proposed to provide adequate space in the workshop. Residents of the neighborhood had raised legal questions relative to the provisions of the City Planning Code; and, in addition, they had questioned the intentions of the applicant. The issue had become quite emotional. It was apparent that residents of the area were worried about the possibility that the applicant was intending to install a third dwelling unit in the building; and he felt that the plans which he had distributed to members of the Commission made it clear that that was not his client's intention. Some issue had been made of the fact that a series of permits had been issued for the subject property. In some cases, errors had been made by the City; and, in other cases, errors had been made by his client. In any case, the filing fee is slight; and he felt that everyone should be entitled to change his mind from time to time. While the staff of the Department of City Planning had cited certain sections of the City Planning Code in its report to the Commission, he felt that it was significant that the staff had made no mention of Section 202.1 of the City Planning Code which provides that a two-family dwelling may be a principal permitted use in an R-1 district providing that the second dwelling unit was constructed prior to May 2, 1960; and he emphasized that the affidavit which had been obtained from the Assessor's Office certified that his client's building had had two dwelling units as far back as 1943. He distributed a mimeographed copy of that section of the code which read as follows:

"PLANNING CODE Section 202.1

Principal Uses Permitted, R-1 Districts.

- (a) All principal uses permitted in R-1-D districts.
- (b) One-family row-type dwelling.
- (c) A two-family dwelling, as regulated in R-2 districts; provided that the second dwelling unit had been constructed prior to the effective date of this Code and provided that a Permit of Occupancy is issued by the Department of Public Works (Central Permit Bureau), within two (2) years of the effective date of this Code (May 2, 1960), to the effect that the two dwelling units conform to the provisions of this Code and related ordinances, and provided that the Assessor has been notified of such improvements."

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general survey of the subject, and to a discussion of the various methods which have been employed for its study. The second part is devoted to a detailed description of the apparatus used in the experiments, and to a discussion of the results obtained. The third part is devoted to a discussion of the theory of the phenomenon, and to a comparison of the experimental results with the theoretical predictions. The fourth part is devoted to a discussion of the applications of the results, and to a summary of the conclusions reached.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the experiments show that the phenomenon is of a purely physical nature, and that it is not affected by the presence of any foreign matter.

The results of the experiments show that the phenomenon is of a purely physical nature, and that it is not affected by the presence of any foreign matter.

The results of the experiments show that the phenomenon is of a purely physical nature, and that it is not affected by the presence of any foreign matter. The results of the experiments show that the phenomenon is of a purely physical nature, and that it is not affected by the presence of any foreign matter. The results of the experiments show that the phenomenon is of a purely physical nature, and that it is not affected by the presence of any foreign matter.

Mr. Passmore advised the Commission that a formal opinion had been rendered by the City Attorney regarding the subject property on July 19, 1972; and that letter opinion had contained the following statement relative to the applicability of Section 202.1 of the City Planning Code to the applicant's building:

"This Section (202.1), on its face, permits two-family dwellings in R-1 zoning districts, and if all the requirements of this Section are met, such a use is considered a conforming use. But this Section is very limited in its application. Not only must the two-family dwelling be used as such prior to May 2, 1960, but a permit of occupancy must be issued for such use within two years of May 2, 1960. The purpose of this Section was to permit owners of property with illegal units to legalize such units, with the approval of the Department of Public Works, within a two-year period. If a permit of occupancy had been applied for and issued prior to May 2, 1962, for the above property, this two-family dwelling would be a conforming use rather than a non-conforming use and would not be subject to Sections 151 through 156 of the Code. But such is not the case. This property is a non-conforming use and, therefore, is subject to the foregoing discussion on non-conforming uses.

"It is my opinion that Section 202.1(c) does not apply to this fact situation, that the use of the subject property is a non-conforming use, and that pursuant to Planning Code Sections 151 through 156, expansion of such non-conforming use is not prohibited."

Mr. Horn stated that he had sent one of his employees to the City Attorney's office to request any formal opinions which had been issued regarding his client's property; and his employee had issued the following declaration to the effect that no such formal opinion had ever been rendered.

"I, PETER MANKIN, declare:

"I am a law student-clerk, employed in the law offices of Gary David Horn, 310 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California. On September 11, 1973, at my request the City Attorney's Office reviewed all opinions of said office issued in the years 1962 to 1964. On September 12, 1973, both the City Attorney's staff and myself again reviewed said opinions between the above stated years.

"We have found no opinion discussing Planning Code Section 202 or the subsections thereunder issued in 1962, 1963 or 1964. Planning Code Section 202.1 is extant and still in Code.

"I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct."

Mr. Horn emphasized that the plans which he had submitted did not call for the installation of a bathroom or other facilities for residential living in the basement of his client's building; and, in fact, he doubted that it would be feasible to install such facilities. In any case, his client would be obliged to proceed in accordance with the plans which had been filed; and, if there should be deviations from the plans, he felt that it was obvious that they would be noticed by residents of the neighborhood. He advised the Commission that there are 30 buildings on the 300 block of Cumberland Street; and he indicated that 18 of those buildings have basements. Furthermore, a number of the buildings have more than one dwelling unit.

Donald Quick, Chairman of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club, called attention to the fact that he had submitted a petition which had been signed by a number of residents of Cumberland Street requesting that no exceptions or variances be granted to the applicant. He remarked that the so-called "basement" being proposed by the applicant would have picture windows with a panoramic view; and, if the basement were to be constructed, he did not feel that a habitable ceiling height should be permitted. In fact, he questioned whether a ceiling height of 7 feet, as recommended by the Director, should be permitted since people probably can and do reside in dwelling units with ceilings of that height. He stated that the subject neighborhood is crowded at the present time; and, as a result, residents of the area were opposed to increasing the density of the area by adding new living space. He stated that one three-unit building already exists on the street; and the residents of that building own six automobiles.

Commissioner Porter stated she had received a number of letters relative to the matter under discussion; and she indicated that she was disturbed by the fact that many of the letters had requested the Commission to require removal of one of the two existing dwelling units in the building. She doubted that the Commission would have the power to take such action. However, she felt that the Commission should do everything within its power to make sure that the number of dwelling units in the building is not expanded.

The Director stated that the Commission would have the power to abate one of the existing dwelling units; however, he stated that he had not recommended that such an action be taken.

Mrs. John Mohr, owner of property next door to the subject site, stated that she was confident that the proposed basement would become living quarters if the Commission would not require the applicant to fill in the excavation. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Porter, Mrs. Mohr stated that she felt that the Director's recommendation was "very wise."

Mrs. Jay Pfotenhauer, owner of property located across the street from the subject property, stated that three days had been spent excavating for the proposed basement; and she felt that the excavation should be filled in and that the basement should be eliminated entirely.

The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. The letter is addressed to the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is a long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The President discusses the war with the South, the economy, and the future of the nation. He also mentions the importance of the Congress in making decisions about the war and the future of the country.

The second part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 3, 1862. The report is addressed to the President and the Congress. It contains information about the state of the Treasury, the amount of money in the Treasury, and the amount of money that has been spent. The Secretary also discusses the importance of the Treasury in making decisions about the war and the future of the country.

The third part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 3, 1862. The report is addressed to the President and the Congress. It contains information about the state of the Interior, the amount of land in the Interior, and the amount of money that has been spent. The Secretary also discusses the importance of the Interior in making decisions about the war and the future of the country.

The fourth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the War, dated January 3, 1862. The report is addressed to the President and the Congress. It contains information about the state of the War, the amount of soldiers in the War, and the amount of money that has been spent. The Secretary also discusses the importance of the War in making decisions about the war and the future of the country.

The fifth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 3, 1862. The report is addressed to the President and the Congress. It contains information about the state of the Navy, the amount of ships in the Navy, and the amount of money that has been spent. The Secretary also discusses the importance of the Navy in making decisions about the war and the future of the country.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the Director had stated that the Commission did have the power to abate the second dwelling unit in the subject building, asked if the Commission would also have the authority to require removal of similar non-conforming dwellings in other buildings on the street. The Director replied that the Commission would have the authority to require removal of non-conforming dwellings in other buildings on the street only if the owners of the other properties were to file building permit applications.

Mr. Horn stated that it was his opinion that a requirement for abatement of one of the dwelling units in the building would constitute condemnation. In any case, if the Commission were to require the abatement, he believed that it would have to find that an amount equal to or more than one-half of the assessed valuation of the building had been spent for improvements which were not required to bring the building up to code standards; and he remarked that the staff had made no finding to that effect. He stated that the excavations which had been made had been necessary for required foundation work; and the fact that the excavation had been made by machine rather than by hand seemed to him to be of little importance. Given the watchfulness of residents of the neighborhood, he saw no reason why his client should not be allowed to proceed with the project as he wished, particularly since he would be willing to sign the restrictive covenant mentioned by the Director in his recommendation.

Commissioner Rueda asked how long it would take to bring about abatement of a third dwelling unit in the subject building if it should be determined that the basement is being used for such a purpose. Mr. Horn replied that use of the basement as a dwelling unit would place his client in danger of being sued for breach of the restrictive covenant; and, given the diligence of City departments, he expected that the third dwelling unit be abated almost immediately.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked why the applicant was so adamant about having an 8-foot ceiling rather than the 7-foot ceiling which had been recommended by the Director of Planning. James Moore, the applicant, stated that he intended to use the basement area as a workshop; and he indicated that it would be difficult to handle 8-foot lengths of plywood with a ceiling height of 7 feet.

Commissioner Porter expressed interest in knowing what the applicant had done to arouse so much antagonism in other residents of the neighborhood and to make them believe that he intended to develop a third dwelling unit in his building.

Mr. Horn stated that he had not heard any concrete complaints from residents of the neighborhood; however, he noted that one of the members of the audience had objected to the fact that there is a great deal of dirt in his client's backyard.

Commissioner Rueda asked why the applicant was proposing to expand the basement beyond the exterior walls of the first floor of the building. Mr. Moore replied that that proposal had arisen because of an engineering problem.

Mrs. Mohr submitted two letters and requested that they be read by the Secretary. The first, which had been addressed by Don Quick to Robert Passmore of the Department of City Planning on December 3, 1971, read as follows:

"I would like to thank you for the time you spent with myself and Mr. Moore's two adjacent neighbors last November 24th. I speak for myself, the Club, and Mr. Moore's two neighbors when I say we approve of the plans as Mr. Moore discussed them with us on the 24th.

"As a result of the meeting we understand the following facts:

- "1. This will be the last building expansion program for the house.
- "2. The sole purpose of the program is to bring the two unit house up to the standards of the building code.
- "3. A 4-foot wide deck will be built on the rear of the upper unit.
- "4. A stairway will come down from the upper unit deck and will not extend beyond the existing deck on the lower unit.
- "5. The lower unit will be extended northward so that the lower unit will end on line with the end of the present upper unit.
- "6. The deck of the lower unit will not be extended beyond the point it was decked on November 24th.
- "7. The large dirt pile in the backyard will be smoothed down and the yard planted.
- "8. The level below the lower unit will be rat proofed. The floor will not be lowered so the ceiling will be seven feet. The space will not be used as living quarters.
- "9. The front yard will be made level to improve the garden and the planted area will be maintained.
- "10. The front yard will not be made a parking lot and will remain a planted yard in the same manner as every other house on this block.

"The Club is very proud of the many yards in our neighborhood. We were delighted when the Master Plan for the City recognized the greenery we enjoy in our neighborhood. The Club would take extreme exception if any of the City right-of-way were to be cemented for parking."

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Moore if he had agreed to the provisions cited in the letter, including the provision that the height of the ceiling in the basement should be limited to 7 feet. Mr. Moore stated that he had not received a copy of the letter; and he did not recall having agreed to a 7-foot ceiling height in the basement. He stated that he is a building inspector with the Bureau of Architecture; and, whereas remodeling permits can usually be obtained in one day, he had been waiting for three months to obtain approval of his permit.

The second letter which had been submitted by Mrs. Mohr had been addressed to her by the applicant on March 28, 1973, and read as follows: "We will be starting, on or about June 1, 1973, on excavating 336 and 338 Cumberland Street. We do not expect to excavate below any of your existing footings."

Mr. Moore stated that he had not excavated below Mrs. Mohr's footings.

Mrs. Pfotenhauer advised the Commission that the applicant had proceeded with several aspects of his project without having permits.

Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Archibald of the Bureau of Building Inspection could respond to Mrs. Pfotenhauer's statement.

Commissioner Miller, noting that Mr. Horn had stated that his client would be willing to sign the restrictive covenant proposed by the Director, asked if that restrictive covenant would be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative, indicating that the restrictive covenant would in effect be a contract between the Zoning Administrator and the present or any subsequent owner of the property.

Commissioner Miller then asked the applicant when he had acquired the subject property. Mr. Moore replied that he had acquired the property in 1967.

Commissioner Porter asked if the property had been under condemnation prior to the time that it was purchased by the applicant. Mr. Moore stated that the 3-R report which had been issued did not indicate that the building was under condemnation; and he had not learned about the condemnation until approximately four months later.

Mr. Horn stated that no work was done on the property without a permit.

Commissioner Miller assumed that the applicant intended to live in the building since the basement workshop was being designed for his use; and, if so, he wondered if the applicant would use the building as a single-family dwelling or if he would continue to rent the second dwelling unit. Mr. Moore replied that he would live in one of the units and rent the other.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the third "whereas" clause of the draft resolution which had been prepared by the Director specified that the proposed addition was designed in such a manner as to make the basement an occupiable floor of living, suggested that the clause should be reworded to specify that the proposed addition was designed in such a manner as could make the basement an occupiable floor of living. The Director agreed to the change.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, as revised, be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7072 and that Building Application No. 425794 be disapproved unless the plans filed with the application are modified so as to provide 1.) that no portion of the basement have a ceiling height greater than 7 feet, and 2.) that no portion of the basement extend beyond the present exterior walls of the first floor of the subject dwelling. The Commission also specified that

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

THE EFFECT OF VITAMIN DEFICIENCY ON THE METABOLISM OF THE RAT
BY J. H. HOLLAND, JR., AND J. H. HOLLAND, JR.

the modified plan should not be approved by the Zoning Administrator unless they are accompanied by the placing on the land records in the County Recorder's Office of a notice of special restrictions approved by the Zoning Administrator, restricting the use of the resulting basement area to solely an accessory area for the existing lower dwelling unit in the subject dwelling, with such basement not to be used for living accommodations of any nature, or income-producing purposes.

R73.47 BLUXOME STREET, ESTABLISHING OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTH OF 10 FEET
ON NORTH SIDE BETWEEN 4TH AND 5TH STREETS.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, stated that Bluxome Street is a 54-foot wide alley situated between Brannan and Townsend Streets, running from 4th to 6th Streets. Spur tracks run much of its length, serving the industrial and warehousing buildings which front on Brannan and Townsend. The southerly two-thirds of the 4th to 5th block along Brannan Street has been cleared to make way for a new tennis club. The developers wished to install a sidewalk along their frontage, hence the establishment of an official width. No other widths had been established along the street.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that establishment of 10 feet as official sidewalk width on the north side of Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the establishment of 10 feet as the official sidewalk width on the north side of Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets is in conformity with the Master Plan.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS MADE ON MASTER PLAN ELEMENTS NOW IN PROCESS OF PRE-
PARATION.

George A. Williams, Assistant Director (Plans and Programs), reported that the staff of the Department of City Planning is presently committed to work on 4 elements of the Master Plan, namely Noise, Seismic Safety, Safety/Emergency Preparedness, and Police Facilities. Of those four, all but the Police Facilities Plan have been mandated by the State of California. Work on three of the elements is actively under way; however, the work program for the Safety/Emergency Preparedness Plan is just being formulated. He stated that the Department also intends to begin work on background for a plan for commerce and industry whenever staff is available. He then called on Sidney Shaw, Planner III, Lucian Blazej, City Planning Coordinator, and William Duchek, Planner III (Urban Design), to summarize the work done to date on the Noise Element, the Police Facilities Element, and the Seismic Safety Element, respectively.

R73.50 JURISDICTIONAL TRANSFER OF JOHN ADAMS AND ALEMANY ADULT SCHOOLS
TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The John Adams and Alemany Adult Schools were used exclusively by the Adult and Occupational Division of the Unified School District before the Community College District was created. In compliance with State law the new district was formed, and on November 5, 1970, the Board of Education resolved that all personal and real property be transferred to the district. Since that time both bodies have treated these properties as though the transfer were complete, however, the formal jurisdictional transfer has not been carried out.

"Your Commission recently approved acquisition of a site for a downtown campus for the District at the corner of 4th and Mission Streets. It was reported that the structure would accommodate programs currently at then two existing adult schools. Presumably they will then become surplus property or be put to other public use. For the interim, however, the properties should be in the jurisdiction of the Community College District."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that he be authorized to report that the transfer of the property would not affect the Master Plan.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the transfer of Lot 4, Block 739, and Lot 1, Block 1196, to the Community College District does not affect the Master Plan.

R73.35 MISSION AND HOWARD STREETS: PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSING, YERBA BUENA CENTER, SIDEWALK AND AIR SPACE VACATION.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Yerba Buena Center is designed to have a system of pedestrian ways commencing at sidewalk level on Market Street and ramping to an overpass level above Mission and Howard Streets. The path winds up and around St. Patrick's Church and park, crossing over Mission with 18.5 ft. clearance. Between Mission and Howard Streets is a large plaza, featuring extensive pools and fountains. To the east of the plaza will be an apparel mart, to the west a hotel. Retail space will surround the plaza.

"Leading southerly from the plaza is a large overhead structure, called the skylight. The pedestrian way continues southerly across Howard Street, leaving 15 ft. clearance. The airspace being vacated above Mission is 22 feet high, and the airspace above Howard is 48 feet, which accommodates the skylight structure as well as the pedestrian bridge.

"In addition to the overhead airspace vacation, the sidewalk would be partially vacated to accommodate the piers supporting the bridges,

3 feet on each side. This poses no problem because the actual walkways will be widened onto the adjoining property, allowing pedestrians to circulate freely on both sides of the piers.

"The approved redevelopment plan for Yerba Buena Center mentions pedestrian bridges in its text, but their locations were not specified. The definitive design for YBC came at a much later date.

"In recommending approval of the pedestrian overpass location and design, it should be pointed out that there are other aspects of the design of Yerba Buena Center which do not conform to the Master Plan. Specifically, the apparel mart garage entrance/exit on Mission Street is in conflict with City policy to discourage automobile traffic generation on Mission Street, and the adequacy of bus loading and storage facilities on Howard Street is questionable."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the vacation of air space and portions of sidewalk space on Mission and Howard Streets for pedestrian overpasses in Yerba Buena Center be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he likes the openness which street space provides; and he objected to structures which penetrate that openness, such as the overcrossing in front of the Chinese Cultural Center. Furthermore, he believed that the proposed overcrossing, as designed, would be just one more concession to the "erector-set design" of the Yerba Buena Center project. He stated that both Mission Street and Howard Street have many blocks of ugliness already; and he felt that more ugliness is not needed on either street.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that Mission Street would be greatly enhanced by the proposed Yerba Buena Center development; and he believed that the same would be true for Howard Street, but to a slightly lesser extent.

Commissioner Porter remarked that Mission and Howard Streets at the present time look like "the land which God forgot;" and she felt that the proposed development might improve the appearance of those streets.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried 5 to 1 that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of air space and portions of sidewalk space on Mission and Howard Streets for pedestrian overpasses in Yerba Buena Center, as shown on Bureau of Engineering Drawings SUR-1373 and SUR-1473, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioners Farrell, Fleishhacker, Miller, Porter and Rueda voted "Aye;" Commissioner Ritchie voted "No."

ZM73.36 445-36 CLAREMONT STREET, WEST LINE, 100 FEET SOUTH OF
ULLOA STREET.

R-1-D TO C-2 DISTRICT.

(UNDER ADVISEMENT from Meeting of September 6, 1973)

Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning), stated that George Choppelas, attorney for the applicant, had requested that this matter be taken under advisement from the meetings of July 5 and September 6 so that he could obtain an opinion from the City Attorney as to whether a restrictive covenant could be entered into which would give assurance that the subject property would be restricted to its present use even if it were to be reclassified from R-1-D to C-2. The City Attorney had replied to Mr. Choppelas that the type of covenant proposed would be legal and enforceable, subject to certain specific conditions; however, the City would have to rely on the covenantee or his successors in interest for enforcement action since the City would not be the covenantee nor would it be privy to the covenant agreement; and, accordingly, the City could not itself institute legal action to enforce the covenant. Mr. Passmore summarized the presentation which had been made regarding the applicant's proposal during the meeting of July 5; and he reminded the Commission that the Director had recommended at that time that the application be disapproved.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that his recommendation remained unchanged.

Mr. Choppelas emphasized that all his client wished to do was to continue the present use of the building on the property with eight dwelling units and commercial space on the ground floor. He stated that he had neglected to advise the City Attorney that the City and County of San Francisco owns property adjacent to his client's property; and, as a result, the City Attorney had not been aware that the City could, in fact, be a party to the restrictive covenant which he had proposed.

The Director stated that Mr. Kenealey of the City Attorney's Office had informally advised the staff that any conveyance to the City, such as the one which Mr. Choppelas was proposing, could be accepted only by the Board of Supervisors. He emphasized that the matter before the Commission for consideration was a request for a change of zone; and, since he did not feel that the proposal for extension of the adjacent commercial district was warranted, he had recommended that the application be disapproved. He also noted that the Commission had never taken conditional action on a rezoning application since the present zoning ordinance was adopted in 1960.

Commissioner Porter observed that the owner of the property would be permitted to replace the eight existing dwelling units if his building should be destroyed by fire or other disaster. Mr. Choppelas stated that he was aware of that fact. The problem, however, was that the commercial use presently occupying the ground floor would have to be changed into a residential dwelling unit in 1980 if no action were taken by the Commission to change the situation. He stated that his client had recently tried to obtain a loan and had been refused because of the non-conforming status of the building; and, as a result, he was anxious to have the status of the building clarified.

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

1890

Commissioner Miller recalled that the owner of the property had requested that the property be zoned C-2 when the new zoning ordinance was put into effect in 1960; and, since his request was turned down, he felt that the non-conforming use status of the property had been made clear at that time.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not regard the present use of the ground floor as being objectionable; and he wondered if any complaints regarding the use had been received from residents of the neighborhood.

Paul Spencer, 1385 Portola Drive, stated that he had written a letter to the Commission on July 5 stating his opposition to the requested reclassification. He did not feel that the adjacent commercial district should be extended. If the subject property were to be reclassified for commercial use, it might be converted into an office building, bringing increased traffic and parking congestion to the area; and, if the offices should prove to be unsuccessful, the building might be torn down and replaced with a less desirable commercial facility.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Spencer if he objected to the present use of the building. Mr. Spencer replied in the negative but indicated that he would object if the property were to be reclassified so that the property could be used for any of the wide range of commercial activities permitted in a C-2 district.

Commissioner Farrell, noting that Mr. Spencer lives across Portola Drive from the subject property, asked why he felt that he would be affected by the requested change of zone. Mr. Spencer replied that approval of the zone change would bring the existing commercial district closer to his property; and, in addition, use of the building for commercial activities would bring more traffic to the area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the letter which Mr. Choppelas had sent to the City Attorney had indicated that the intent of the restrictive covenant would be to limit the use of the property to the "existing use," asked if the words "existing use" were intended to refer to the tile company which presently occupies the ground floor of the building. Mr. Choppelas replied in the negative. He stated that the tile company may not remain in business forever; and his intention was that the restrictive covenant should provide that the ground floor of the building could continue to be used for commercial purposes and that the remainder of the building would continue to be used for residential purposes.

The Director observed that introduction of a new commercial use, such as a drugstore or a restaurant, would substantially alter the character of the building.

Commissioner Miller remarked that reclassification of the subject property to C-2 would also give transitional status to the adjacent property.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was sympathetic to the applicant's desire to retain the tile company on the ground floor of his building; however, there appeared to be no feasible way for the Commission to accommodate him in that regard.

Page 100

100

The first of these is the fact that the population of the country is increasing rapidly. This is due to a number of causes, including the fact that the birth rate is high and the death rate is low.

The second cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more industrialized. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are employed in the manufacturing and service industries.

The third cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more urbanized. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are living in cities and towns. This is due to the fact that the cities and towns are becoming more and more attractive places to live.

The fourth cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more educated. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to read and write. This is due to the fact that the government is spending more and more money on education.

The fifth cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more healthy. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to live longer lives. This is due to the fact that the government is spending more and more money on health care.

The sixth cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more prosperous. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to afford to live in cities and towns. This is due to the fact that the country's economy is growing rapidly.

The seventh cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more democratic. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to participate in the political process. This is due to the fact that the government is becoming more and more open to the people.

The eighth cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more united. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to live in peace and harmony. This is due to the fact that the government is becoming more and more united with the people.

The ninth cause is the fact that the country is becoming more and more powerful. This is leading to a large increase in the number of people who are able to live in a secure and stable environment. This is due to the fact that the country's military and economic power is growing rapidly.

The Director remarked that the tile company can legally remain until 1980; and, during the interim, non-conforming use studies might be undertaken by the staff which could lead to a solution to the applicant's problem.

Commissioner Farrell asked if there would be any advantage in holding the subject application under advisement until those studies are completed. The Director replied in the negative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7073 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

Published weekly, except during the summer months, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies are sold at 15 cents. The journal is published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

Copyright, 1964, by American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this journal in whole or in part without the written permission of the American Medical Association is prohibited.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103 of the Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1964.

Postpaid

Volume 111
Number 1
January 1964

ABJ

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 20, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 20, 1973, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; John C. Farrell, Mortimer Fleishhacker, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, President, and Thomas J. Mellon, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; George A. Williams, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Edward Michael, Planner III; Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Moira So, Planner III; Carl Nes, Planner II; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; Nathaniel Taylor, Planner II; Linda Ferbert, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Farrell, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of August 16, 1973, be approved as submitted and that the minutes of the meeting of August 23, 1973, be approved with one correction of a clerical error.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, distributed copies of the Department of City Planning's annual report for fiscal year 1972-73.

The Director announced that he had received a letter advising that Mrs. Maris Fravel and Mrs. Robert MacDonnell will attend Commission meetings during the next year as Junior League Observers.

The Director advised the Commission that the Police Department has filed a preliminary environmental impact statement for a recreation facility on Lake Merced at the site of the Police Pistol Range. He indicated that he had pointed out to the Police Department that the Master Plan calls for open space in that area; and he had also observed that jurisdictional questions exist in that the land is owned by the Water Department and also appears to be under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department. Should the Police Department proceed with the proposed project, it would also fall under the jurisdiction of the Coastline Commission.

The Director informed the Commission that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board will hold a public hearing on October 3 to review existing landmarks legislation in order to determine if an amendment should be prepared for consideration by the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

After discussion, the Commission requested that Resolution No. 7074 be prepared to express its deep regret on learning of the death of William W. Wurster. The Commission also indicated its intention of adjourning this meeting in respect to Mr. Wurster's memory.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had seen a rendering in the newspaper of the building which the San Francisco Community College District plans to construct for its downtown campus on the northwest corner of 4th and Mission Streets; and he indicated that he was concerned about the fact that pursuit of the plans as indicated would apparently result in a dark colored building. In view of the agreement with the Redevelopment Agency, under which the Director of Planning would be permitted to review plans for new buildings in the Yerba Buena Center, he felt that an effort should be made to encourage the Community College District to construct a light colored building. The Director replied that he had shared Commissioner Ritchie's concern when he had seen the rendering in the newspaper; and he indicated that he had already written a letter to express his concern.

LM73.4 - CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE THE HASLETT WAREHOUSE,
680 BEACH STREET, AS A LANDMARK.

Edward Michael, Planner III, summarized the architectural and historic characteristics of the subject building as set forth in a case report which had been prepared for the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended approval of the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark.

Amy Meyer, representing People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, stated that it was originally intended that the Haslett Warehouse was to be included in the Golden Gate National Recreation area; however, it had been left out of the area by mistake. She informed the Commission that legislation is being prepared to correct that error.

Jean Kortum, representing San Francisco Tomorrow, expressed support for the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark. She stated that she also favored passage of the Assembly Bill which had been introduced by Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., which would prevent the General Services Department of the State of California from disposing of the Haslett Warehouse for at least one year.

Peter Evans read the following letter which had been addressed to the Commission by J. S. Holliday, Executive Director of the California Historical Society:

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results of the study have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

"On behalf of the California Historical Society, I write to express our strong endorsement and support of the Historic Landmark designation for the Haslett Warehouse. Believing that the Haslett Warehouse has historic significance, that it is a vital part of the attractiveness and architectural distinctiveness of the Ghirardelli-Cannery-Maritime Park complex, and further that it is a building of great potential cultural value to the city of San Francisco, we urge that the Haslett Warehouse be recognized as an Historic Landmark."

Susan King, an architectural historian, indicated her support of the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark.

David Nelson, Assistant Director of the San Francisco Maritime Museum, advised the Commission that the museum strongly favors designation of the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark; and he noted that the Board of Supervisors had voted unanimously to support Assemblyman Brown's bill calling for a one year moratorium on the sale of the building by the State. In conclusion, he called attention to a letter which had been prepared by William Matson Roth in support of the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark.

The Secretary read a letter which had been received from Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., as follows:

"It is my understanding that you have before you today an item relating to the Haslett Warehouse.

"Earlier this year I introduced AB 2318 which would delay for one year the authority that General Services currently has to sell the building. My office has been contacted by several groups who would like to see the Warehouse remain in public possession and it seems to me that we first need to see that the building is preserved and then decide which of several plans would most enhance this historically significant structure.

"AB 2318 has passed the Assembly and will be heard in Senate Governmental Organization when the Legislature resumes in January. It is my hope that no action on the part of General Services will be taken until the fate of the legislation is determined."

The Secretary then read a letter which had been received from Lew Clingan, Deputy Director of the State of California Department of General Services, which read as follows:

"We have been advised the Planning Commission is considering proposing to the Board of Supervisors the designation of the above building and site as a Landmark.

"In our opinion this designation may have a diminutive value influence on the property and for this reason we oppose the designation.

...

...

...

...

...

"Chapter 1764, Statutes of 1971 authorizes the sale of the warehouse. Sale proceeds will go to the Department of Parks and Recreation for operation, maintenance and development of the San Francisco Maritime State Historic Park. If the warehouse is designated a Landmark, its market value may be lowered with a resultant loss in funds to improve the Historic Park.

"We respectfully request the Commission not propose this property as a Landmark to the Board of Supervisors."

Dean Bailey, representing the State Department of General Services, informed the Commission that the San Francisco Bureau of Building Inspection had determined that the Haslett Warehouse is unsafe both structurally and from the standpoint of fire danger. As a result, any prospective purchaser might have to make substantial interior and exterior alterations to the building; and, in view of the fact that some of those alterations could be in conflict with the Landmarks Ordinance, he felt that designation of the building as a Landmark might have the effect of lowering the value of the property.

The Director asked Mr. Bailey why the State has not evicted its present tenants if the building is so unsafe. Commissioner Porter stated that she had intended to ask the same question.

Mr. Bailey stated that the building does not have enough lateral strength to survive an earthquake; however, he remarked that thousands of buildings in San Francisco are in similar jeopardy.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he did not understand how landmark designation could possibly have an effect on the value of the building if the building is really in such bad shape. Mr. Bailey replied that he did not know whether prospective purchasers of the property would demolish the building or if they would attempt conversion; however, if the building were to be converted, code problems might be encountered if the building were to be designated as a Landmark.

Commissioner Porter emphasized that landmark designation applies only to the exterior facades and not to the interiors of designated building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker advised Mr. Bailey that modifications may be made even on the facades of designated Landmark buildings if such modifications are approved by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and by the City Planning Commission.

Mrs. Bland Platt, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that notice had been given to the State Department of Parks and Recreation when the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse as a Landmark was being considered by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board; however, the Department of General Services had not been notified of the proceedings because the Landmarks Board was not aware that jurisdiction over the building had been transferred to that agency.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The second part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The third part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The fourth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The fifth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The sixth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The seventh part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The eighth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The ninth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The tenth part of the report contains a list of the various projects and the results achieved. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

Commissioner Porter asked if the State would continue to lease space in the Haslett Warehouse if the building were truly unsafe. Mr. Bailey replied that the building was remodeled under the standards of the State Fire Marshall which are different from the standards of the San Francisco Building Code; and, if the building were to be acquired by a private owner, a substantial amount of work would probably have to be done to bring the structure up to San Francisco Building Code standards.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that it was his opinion that the State had had an obligation to the tenants of the building and to the City and County of San Francisco to make sure that the Haslett Warehouse was safe and that it came as close as possible to meeting local building code standards. Having failed to fulfill that obligation, he did not feel that the State should argue against designation of the building as a Landmark on the basis that the building does not meet code standards.

Mr. Bailey stated that proceeds from the sale of the property would go to the San Francisco Maritime Park; and, as a result, he felt that the value of the property should not be lowered by Landmark designation. With regard to the State's responsibility for the remodeling project, he advised the Commission that the building had been surreptitiously remodeled for office use without the State's full knowledge.

The Director reminded the Commission that the only issue being considered was whether the Haslett Warehouse is worthy of being designated as a Landmark.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that designation of the building as a Landmark be approved. He felt that the worthiness of the building as a landmark was somewhat marginal and probably related to the location of the building more than anything else. He remarked that San Francisco has a number of buildings with similar architecture; and he remarked that the historical significance of the Haslett Warehouse is limited. The building does, however, lie between the Cannery and Ghirardelli Square; and, although no historic district has been established in the area, Ghirardelli Square has been designated as a Landmark and the Cannery has been awarded a Certificate of Merit. The main virtue of the Haslett Warehouse is that it is an attractive building which overlooks Victorian Park; and, while he did not believe that the proposal to designate the building should develop into a major issue, he did believe that the building should be designated as a Landmark.

Mrs. Platt stated that the Haslett Warehouse is similar in architectural style to the old Fontana Warehouse which was constructed in 1886 and is now the site of the Fontana Apartments. For that reason, she felt that the building is significant in the architectural history of the City.

Commissioner Rueda seconded the motion for approval of the proposal to designate the building as a Landmark, indicating that he shared the sentiments which had been expressed by Commissioner Fleishhacker.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 7075 and to approve the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse, 680 Beach Street, as a Landmark.

The Director requested that the State report to the Department of City Planning if landmark designation should, in fact, have the effect of lessening the sale value of the property. The Department of City Planning would then be in a position to use that alleged savings as leverage in working with the new owner of the building to achieve successful rehabilitation of the structure.

LM73.3 - CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE THE MERRYVALE BUILDING,
3640 BUCHANAN STREET, AS A LANDMARK.

Edward Michael, Planner III, summarized the architectural and historic characteristics of the subject building as outlined in greater detail in a case report which had been prepared for the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

No one was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the proposal to designate the building as a Landmark.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the proposal to designate the building as a Landmark be approved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7076 be adopted and that the proposal to designate the Merryvale Building, 3640 Buchanan Street, as a Landmark be approved.

PUBLIC HEARING ON WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY
PLANNING FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1974, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1975.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, summarized the major work elements in the Department's work program for the current fiscal year and mentioned additional projects which are being considered for inclusion in the 1974-75 work program.

Robert Kirkwood, President of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, submitted and summarized the following prepared statement:

"My name is Robert Kirkwood, and I am President of SPUR, the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association. In the past, SPUR has offered comments on the City Planning Department's proposed work program only after it was nearing completion. This year, SPUR is attempting to participate earlier in the process of developing a planning work program and budget.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the transparency and accountability of the organization. This section also outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, ensuring that the information is reliable and up-to-date.

2. The second part of the document focuses on the financial aspects of the organization. It provides a detailed overview of the budget, including the projected income and expenses for the upcoming year. This section also discusses the various financial risks and how they are being managed to ensure the organization's financial stability.

3. The third part of the document addresses the human resources of the organization. It discusses the current staffing levels, the skills and experience of the employees, and the plans for future recruitment and training. This section also highlights the importance of maintaining a positive work environment and fostering a culture of collaboration and innovation.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the organization's marketing and sales strategy. It outlines the various marketing channels being used to reach the target audience, including social media, email marketing, and direct mail. This section also discusses the sales process and the various sales techniques being used to increase revenue.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the organization's legal and regulatory compliance. It outlines the various laws and regulations that the organization is subject to, including those related to data protection, employment, and financial reporting. This section also discusses the steps being taken to ensure that the organization is in full compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the organization's environmental and social responsibility. It outlines the various initiatives being implemented to reduce the organization's carbon footprint, improve its energy efficiency, and support the local community. This section also discusses the organization's commitment to diversity and inclusion, and the steps being taken to ensure that all employees are treated fairly and with respect.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the organization's overall performance and future prospects. It provides a summary of the key findings from the various sections of the document and discusses the organization's strengths and weaknesses. This section also discusses the organization's vision for the future and the steps being taken to achieve its long-term goals.

"In order to assist the Planning Commission as much as possible, SPUR's recommendations will be presented in the format used by the Planning Department to define its basic work tasks. We will also comment briefly on the Department's present approach to providing information to the general public.

"Two elements of the Comprehensive Plan currently being prepared need to receive greater emphasis than in the past. First, closure of most large California state institutions for the mentally handicapped has in some communities resulted in the unhealthy clustering of home-based care facilities. In San Francisco this has placed a burden on existing community services, and potentially threatens the disruption of residential areas. The Planning Department is presently conducting a location analysis of home-based care facilities. This effort should be followed by preparation of elements of an Improvement Plan for Community Services that respond to the basic problem of shelter and related facilities for the mentally handicapped. While community services plans certainly should address the needs of all San Franciscans, the increase in home-based care facilities makes the preparation of such plans all the more urgent.

"At present, only police and library facilities have been addressed in this planning effort. We think you will agree that planned health and social service facilities are also essential for meeting our community's needs. SPUR applauds the Planning and Police Commissions for jointly preparing the police facilities plan. We recommend that the Department continue to seek similar contributions from other agencies that should be included in future planning elements.

"An overall statement of Goals and Strategy for the Comprehensive Plan should be a primary tool to be used in allocating general and special revenue sharing funds. Allocation of these highly flexible funds should be based on long range goals and objectives rather than on ad hoc responses to short range problems. Otherwise, the freedom from restrictive guidelines promised by this program will result in aimless expenditures of little impact.

"We realize that you are currently approaching this problem through the preparation of an Introduction to the Master Plan, but we question whether this effort will sufficiently highlight the resulting planning goals framework. Translating the adopted elements of the Comprehensive Plan into an independent goals and strategy statement should assist the City in evaluating neighborhood and department requests for revenue sharing monies. It should also be useful as a means for coordinating the capital improvements plan with the Comprehensive Plan and would dovetail with the community improvement programming process recently recommended to the Mayor.

"SPUR believes that two already completed elements of the Comprehensive Plan should receive higher priority in staffing than in the past. The Planning Department has yet to include criteria for the housing needs of different income groups in its quantified housing program. We believe this is essential if concrete policies are to be developed for implementing the Improvement Plan for Residence.

"One facet of the Urban Design Plan, the Protected Residential Areas program, needs to be upgraded. Now that the Department has succeeded in obtaining general revenue sharing funds for implementing this program, a greater effort is necessary to publicize it so that various neighborhood groups will have an opportunity create pressure for the allocation of yet more funds. The publication of an information sheet on the program, which we understand you are considering, should only be the first step in assisting neighborhood groups to utilize it.

"SPUR lauds the Planning Department's recently completed effort to prepare a Neighborhood Improvement Plan for Haight-Ashbury. We understand, however, that the Department now believes that efforts of this magnitude consume more in costs than they provide in benefits. While planning assistance on a smaller scale might be suitable for other areas of the City, SPUR remains convinced that a South of Market plan must be prepared, a suggestion we have made annually for almost a decade. Every year this area witnesses more activity, yet there is no plan or even understanding of what will eventually emerge. If the Planning Commission is unable to obtain adequate resources for the preparation of such a plan, SPUR is still interested in working with you to establish some sort of planning charette.

"The Department's new, three-level approach to area planning seems to be a decided improvement over the past distribution of effort in this area. In allocating assistance to various neighborhood areas, we hope that the Department will make every effort to assign staff and provide assistance to areas which will enjoy the greatest benefit. Planning assistance is often most effective in neighborhoods in transition or, to put it a bit differently, on the edge of serious deterioration. In already deteriorated areas, such assistance is less useful when compared with other more capital intensive efforts, such as provided by urban renewal.

"Department efforts in the past to provide planning assistance for FACE program areas should now be expanded to incorporate the proposed Rehabilitation Assistance Program, which the Department was instrumental in establishing. At a broader level, possible special revenue sharing programs, combined with the existing general revenue sharing program, will necessitate that the Department increase its liaison activities with the Mayor's Office of Community Development, particularly in implementing the proposed Annual Improvement Programming project.

The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the study and the objectives of the research. It also outlines the methodology used in the study and the results obtained. The second part of the paper discusses the implications of the study and the conclusions drawn from the research. It also discusses the limitations of the study and the areas for further research. The third part of the paper discusses the significance of the study and the contributions it has made to the field of research. It also discusses the practical applications of the study and the policy implications of the research. The fourth part of the paper discusses the future of the study and the areas for further research. It also discusses the challenges faced by the study and the opportunities for future research. The fifth part of the paper discusses the conclusion of the study and the final thoughts of the researcher. It also discusses the overall findings of the study and the key takeaways from the research.

"SPUR applauds the Department for undertaking its two-year study of Residential Zoning. We hope that you will consider as part of the study, actions which the Department itself can initiate to enhance the quality of neighborhood areas, such as establishing or formalizing existing set backs, and initiating your own down zoning efforts. In addition, we think that it is essential to reconsider the existing policy of requiring that small, family-owned grocery and other convenience stores be eliminated from neighborhood areas by 1980. This desire for purity has been questioned with increasing frequency, as people realize that neighborhood-oriented convenience stores are an essential part of the fabric of San Francisco neighborhoods. Their presence within walking distance of residences also has the desired effect of decreasing the dependency on the automobiles for short trips. As the time for closing these stores nears, furthermore, they become a blighting influence on their surrounding area since they are unable to secure necessary financing for capital improvements and maintenance.

"Our main concern arising out of your decision to conduct this study is what will occur in residential areas during the two years required to complete it. The Department is presently recommending the adoption of interim controls to prevent major changes in residential areas while the study is in progress. If these controls are not adopted, or prove to be ineffective, then it will be necessary for the Commission to consider many additional applications from neighborhood areas for down zoning. Without providing for interim controls or considering additional applications, many residential areas could undergo changes of such magnitude as to render ineffective whatever zoning reforms emerge from the study.

"While we have some concerns regarding your proposed economic growth study, we think it can be significant if properly designed. If possible, it should relate to your zoning study, so that the consequences of zoning codes in determining the future residential mix in San Francisco can be projected.

"Zoning code enforcement, perhaps more than any other Departmental activity, has the most immediate impact on the fabric of neighborhood life in San Francisco. At present, for instance, the Department is aware that non-residential uses occupy residentially zoned dwellings in the Haight-Ashbury. This results in a decrease in the number of residential units available, and, in some instances, increased congestion and noise on residential streets. Allowing this situation to exist while preparing an extensive neighborhood improvement plan for the Haight is decidedly contradictory, and code enforcement will have a far more immediate impact on life in the area than will the improvement plan. SPUR recommends that zoning code enforcement staff be substantially increased through the addition of experienced investigative personnel rather than junior planners.

[Illegible text block 1]

[Illegible text block 2]

[Illegible text block 3]

[Illegible text block 4]

"We also suggest that information and opinions readily available from other City departments be used where appropriate to ease the information gathering burden on enforcement personnel. For instance, present enforcement personnel make their own judgments on whether a dwelling is being occupied by a religious or educational non-profit organization, when the tax assessor has already made such a decision according to well-defined procedures in enforcing similar ordinance language. By merely checking with the assessor, enforcement staff could avoid spending the time required to determine the legal status of such organizations, while at the same time insuring that their decision will be consistent with other City agencies.

"Recent events have demonstrated that the present landmarks ordinance is not strong enough to save historically significant buildings in the City for more than a year. Methods of strengthening the ordinance and of finding alternative means to preserve historical structures should be surveyed by the Department. It is possible that suggestions such as those made by residents of Pacific Heights in their recent down zoning request could be utilized as well to save at least historic facades.

"Dissemination of information to the public is presently handled by many different persons in the Department, depending upon what is being requested. This diffusion of responsibility results in staff inefficiencies and public misinterpretations of Department policies and actions. Legal notices mailed to property owners are on occasion incomprehensible to the layman. Departmental plans are printed with elaborate processes that result in elegant documents too expensive to be produced in sufficient quantity for widespread public review.

"Many of these problems could be solved by creating the position of Public Information Officer. This person could be in charge of staff handling routine requests for information, be responsible for supervising neighborhood liaison, and could develop skills in advising the Department how to best print and disseminate important documents. The tabloid newspaper format for the Haight-Ashbury plan summary, for instance, resulted in much more widespread dissemination of an important public document at less cost than usual to the Department. Ideas such as this, perhaps stemming from a SPUR suggestion, should be generated consistently by a Public Information Officer.

"These comments are made with a constructive intent. SPUR has long been in support of a strong and able Planning Department. We find that planning issues assume greater importance each year in San Francisco, and we hope that the Department will receive sufficient funding for fiscal 1974-1975 to enable it to continue its excellent efforts in planning for a better city."

In conclusion, Mr. Kirkwood suggested that the department should have a person assigned full time, possibly at the zoning counter, to advise interested parties of the nature of hearings which have been scheduled. He stated that he had filed for a variance to do some work in his basement; and several people in the neighborhood who had misunderstood the notice which they had received believed that he intended to do work in the rear yard area.

Mrs. Bland Platt, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that she had been requested by the members of her Board to appear before the Commission to discuss the possibility of obtaining additional staff assistance for the Board's work; however, she felt that it would be preferable to present her remarks to the Commission in the form of a letter.

Jack Morrison felt that there is a real need for the Department of City Planning to strengthen the technical assistance which it provides to neighborhood organizations. He stated that he had been told by a number of people that they have good ideas which they would like to have considered; however, they did not know how to present them to the Commission. He observed that liaison activities can sometimes be viewed with suspicion; and, for that reason, he felt that planners serving a liaison function should take the role of advocates for the neighborhood to which they are assigned. Mr. Morrison stated that he was also concerned about plan implementation, especially since many plans, after being promulgated, seemed to be dropped. As a case in point, he remarked that \$300,000 of revenue sharing funds for a protected residential area plan in the Richmond District had been deleted from the budget by the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors. Luckily, however, the neighborhood had waged a campaign to have the funds reinstated; and, in that instance, they had been successful.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked for clarification of Mr. Morrison's suggestion that planners assigned to liaison activities in the neighborhoods should be advocates for those neighborhoods. Mr. Morrison stated that his intention was that the planners should be free to determine the needs of the community in which they are working but that they should also be able to represent the viewpoints of residents of the area.

Peter Mendelsohn, representing TOOR, stated that he agreed with the statements made by Mr. Kirkwood regarding the South of Market area; and he hoped that some progress could be made along the lines which Mr. Kirkwood had suggested. Given the present zoning of the South of Market area, no new housing can be constructed at the present time; however, he hoped that changes could be made which would permit combined residential and manufacturing use of properties in the area. He stated that the South of Market area is not yet a slum. However, since no new housing can be constructed, too many families are being packed into the existing residential buildings; and, as a result, the area will inevitably become a slum if present trends continue. He stated that mixed residential and industrial developments have been successful in Europe; and he believed that they could be successful in San Francisco, also. In addition to new housing, he was also concerned about achieving new parks in the South of Market area to replace parks which were previously removed for the Hall of Justice and for the James Lick Freeway.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Mendelsohn to comment on the boundaries of the South of Market area as he envisioned them. Mr. Mendelsohn replied that he had been accustomed to viewing the area from the Embarcadero to 16th Street as the South of Market district; however, since the Mission district has been laying claim to the area between 16th and 14th Streets, he had agreed to accept 14th Street as the boundary of the South of Market area.

The Director advised the Commission that Carl Nes, a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning, had been assigned as the department's liaison to the South of Market area on a part-time basis.

Donald Horanzy, a member of All People's Coalition, read and submitted the following letter which had been signed by Ronald C. Morton, President of that organization:

"The All Peoples' Coalition (A.P.C.) is a democratic federation of more than 24 organizations based in the greater Visitacion Valley neighborhood of San Francisco.

"The All Peoples' Coalition supports the Area Planning component of the Work Program and Budget for the Department of City Planning for the 1974-75 fiscal year.

"We look forward to working with planners from the Department's neighborhood liaison program on a recognizance study of Visitacion Valley which we understand will be completed during the current fiscal year.

"Once this recognizance study is completed and some of our specific neighborhood needs have been established we are eager to continue working with the Department in the next fiscal year to determine possible improvement actions for our community based on these needs.

"Thank you for your consideration."

Mr. Horanzy stated that he was most anxious for the member of the staff of the Department of City Planning who has been assigned as liaison to the Visitacion Valley to begin his work in the area; and, if that person would concentrate on "planning", members of his organization would do the necessary "advocating".

Mrs. Garabedian, representing the Chairman of the Mayor's committee to restore the Haight-Ashbury district, stated that she wished to speak favorably about the activities of the Department of City Planning in her neighborhood. She was grateful that the department had sent responsible planners to the area to work patiently and constructively with the various diverse groups of the neighborhood; and she believed that those planners had made a serious effort to find out the true feelings of the neighborhood as a whole. In conclusion, she stated that she felt that the media had misinterpreted the neighborhood's reaction to two of the recommendations contained in

the final Haight-Ashbury Report. Contrary to the reports carried in the press, she felt that most of the people in the area recommended for designation as a Rehabilitation Assistance Program were in favor of such a program; and she knew that all of the residents of her block were in favor of the program. The press had also reported that there was a great deal of opposition to the proposal to extend the Municipal Railway subway from the West Portal of the Sunset tunnel to 9th Avenue; however, while it was evident that some problems might arise during construction of that project, the project was generally supported by the members of her committee.

Tom Daley, representing the Haight-Ashbury Improvement Association, stated that he, also, appreciated what the Department of City Planning has done in the Haight-Ashbury district. However, he was concerned about the number of permits which are being approved for junk stores on Haight Street. He recognized that responsibility for approval of the permits lies with the Police Department; yet, he did not believe that the applications were being given sufficient scrutiny. If such uses continue to proliferate on the street, Haight Street may become another "MacAllister Street" and may eventually be made the subject of a redevelopment project.

The Reverend Harry Chuck, representing the Chinatown Coalition for Better Housing, stated that he had been somewhat skeptical three years ago when a housing and recreation study was proposed for Chinatown since such studies had rarely resulted in any tangible progress. Yet, the study had been made; and, as a result, changes have been made. Chinatown now has a new mini-park; and substantial progress has been made on the Stockton Street Housing Project. In addition, a responsible organization concerned with housing has developed in Chinatown. He expressed his appreciation to the Department of City Planning for the work which they had done in Chinatown.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that achievements had been made in Chinatown because residents of the neighborhood were willing to cooperate with the staff of the Department of City Planning and with the City Planning Commission; however, he stressed that there is much more to be done in the area.

No one else in the audience wished to address the Commission.

At 4:25 p.m., following further discussion of general planning issues by members of the Commission, Vice President Porter announced that the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 27, 1973.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 27, 1973, at 2:15 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; John C. Farrell, Thomas J. Mellon, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, President; and Mortimer Fleishhacker and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; Marie Zeller, Planner III (Administrative); Alec Bash, Planner III; Arthur Fulton, Planner II; Wilbert Hardee, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Bill Boldenweck represented the San Francisco Examiner; and Mel Wax represented Television Channel 9.

1:00 P.M. Field Trip

The field trip scheduled for 1:00 p.m. was cancelled.

2:15 P.M., Room 282, City Hall

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, informed the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Monday, had voted 10 to 0 to approve the proposed re-classification of "Kite Hill" from R-3 to R-1.

Following an inquiry by the Director, the members of the Commission indicated that they would be available for a special meeting to be scheduled on the evening of Tuesday, November 20, for a public hearing on Interim Residential District Controls.

118.73.20 TENTATIVE MAP, PORTION OF BLOCK 6117, KAREN WAY

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Karen Court is located half a block north of Woodrow Wilson High School in the Portola-McLaren district, and comprises a T-shaped cul-de-sac off Somerset Street. The property in question was subdivided in 1971, at that time into lots with alternating widths of 25 and 28 feet. The proposed tentative map is a resubdivision of 8 of these lots to a uniform lot width of 26.50 feet each, with no change in the number of parcels. Inasmuch as this is a matter of minor lot line adjustment, it is categorically exempt from the Environmental Review process.

"The neighborhood is in an R-1 single family residential district. Lot area requirements (2640 square feet in R-1 zones) are satisfied. The lot widths conform to the general pattern in the vicinity."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the tentative subdivision map be approved as submitted.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the tentative map of a portion of Assessor's Block 6117, prepared by Yarnell and Ron, dated September, 1973, is approved as submitted.

EE73.88 PUBLIC HEARING ON A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL
AIRPORT.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, called on R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), to summarize the draft of the Environmental Impact Report. Following Mr. Steele's presentation, William E. McDonnell, President of the Airports Commission, William J. Dwyer, Director of Airports, and Thomas G. Bertken, Deputy Director for Planning, Engineering, and Construction for the Airport described the proposed expansion project.

The Commission proceeded to hear from the following speakers:

Gordon Miller, State Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics; William Brinton, Attorney and representative of the San Francisco Ecology Center; Charlie Starbuck, S.F. Ecology Center; Robert D. Davis, Greater S.F. Chamber of Commerce; Robert Joseph Jirks, Int'l. Ass'n. of Machinists & Aero Space Workers, Local Lodge 1781; C. F. Gregg, Pan Am S.F. Int'l. Airport (1) Air Transport Ass'n. of America (2) S.F. Bay Area Council; H. J. "Bud" Bostwick, San Mateo City Development Committee; Dr. Maurice Garbell, S.F. Pres., Garbell Inc. Aviation Consultants to City of South San Francisco; Paul Howell, S.F. Convention and Visitors Bureau; John Mulqueeney, City of San Bruno Planning Director; Robert Saunders, President, Consolidated Flower Shippers of S. F. Bay Area; Lloyd Pflueger, Manager, Downtown Association; Roy Wilson, Central Labor Council of San Mateo; Betty Rader, 17 Alta St., Hans Feibusch, Environmental Impact Planning Corp.; James Jones, San Mateo City Convention & Visitors Bureau; Susan Smith, S.F. Tomorrow; Gil Bailie, Plaintiff - Airport Lawsuit; Robert Gilmore, Central Labor Council of San Mateo; Ruth T. Smith, M.D., Environmental Pollution Committee of San Mateo County Medical Society; Dick Jordan, S.F. Bay Area Chapter of the Sierra Club, Sylvia M. Gregory, 741 Madison Avenue; W. E. Walker, Mayor, City of Foster City; Elinor Larsen, Peninsula Regional Group, Sierra Club; Barry Levine, Mill Valley, CA, Friends of the Earth; Mrs. Rose Urbach, San Bruno Sound Abatement Rep.; and Steven Lerman, 19 Cardenas Avenue.

September 27, 1973

A standard tape cassette recording of the proceedings is available in the offices of the Department of City Planning for public listening or transcription. In addition, a court reporter in the employ of the Airports Commission was present and will prepare a transcript of the proceedings.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the matter was continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on October 11, 1973, at 2:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

